



REASONS

FOR

NOT TAKING THE TEST;

FOR

NOT CONFORMING TO THE ESTABLISHED
CHURCH;

AND FOR

NOT DESERTING THE ANCIENT FAITH;

WITH PRELIMINARY AND CONCLUDING
OBSERVATIONS;

TOGETHER WITH

SOME REMARKS ON THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH'S
LATE CHARGE,

&c. &c.

BY

JOHN, EARL OF SHREWSBURY.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOSEPH BOOKER, NEW BOND STREET.

1828.

REASONS

NOT TAKING THE TEST

AND CONFORMING TO THE ESTABLISHED
CATHOLIC

OF THE

NOT DEPARTING THE ANCIENT FAITH

WITH FREQUENT AND CONCISE
QUESTIONS

AND ANSWERS

WITH REMARKS ON THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSITIONS
AND ANSWERS

London:—Printed by C. RICHARDS,
St. Martin's-lane, Charing-cross.

JOHN, EARL OF SHERBURY

LONDON:

PRINTED BY C. RICHARDS, ST. MARTIN'S-LANE, CH. CROSS.

1818

TO HIS GRACE

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK,

EARL MARSHALL,

&c. &c. &c.

CONCEIVING myself called upon to vindicate the religion of my Catholic fellow-countrymen from the virulent calumnies so unwarrantably fixed upon it by the laws of the land, as well as to defend their conduct in their capacity of members of the state, I cannot bring the hasty result of my labours before the Public, in a manner more worthy of the subject, or more agreeable to my own feelings, than by dedicating them to your Grace.

The Catholics of this Empire may be justly proud in the reflection that, while they are fellow-sufferers in the same cause with the

that it should exist *now*, as a measure of high state policy, is beyond all reason and understanding. How the faithful and honourable discharge of the duties of Parliament can be affected more by a belief in Transubstantiation, than by a belief in Consubstantiation, or by a disbelief in the real presence altogether; how a man is less fitted to

considered as an indelible disgrace upon the English nation; in which king, parliament, judges, juries, witnesses, have all their respective, though certainly not equal, shares. Witnesses of such a character as not to deserve credit in the most trifling cause, upon the most immaterial facts, gave evidence so incredible, or to speak more properly, so impossible to be true, that it ought not to have been believed if it had come from the mouth of Cato; and upon such evidence from such witnesses, were innocent men condemned to death and executed." We have only to look around us to be satisfied that the same delusion still exists in the minds of many;—that even those master-spirits who are the enemies of emancipation, are haunted with the same imaginary horrors of Popery; and that both our doctrine as Christians, and our reputation as subjects, are, to this very day, condemned upon evidence equally incredible and impossible.

When this Test was passing the House of Lords, "Gunning, bishop of Ely, maintained that the Church of Rome was not idolatrous. The lords did not much mind Gunning's arguments, but passed the bill. And though Gunning had said he could not take that test with a good conscience, yet as soon as the bill was passed, he took it in the crowd with the rest."—*Burnet*.

serve his country, because he acknowledges a *spiritual* authority in the Bishop of Rome, as head of the Christian Church, than if he believed that authority to belong to the King of England, are paradoxes which no reflecting mind can for an instant entertain. That *they* who preach, (in conformity with the Doctrine of Christ,) that the kingdom of God is not of this world, and that men are bound to honour and obey their king, and to be subject to the civil power, under pain of damnation; that *they* should hold a divided allegiance, between the spiritual head of their Church, and the lawful authorities of their country, it is preposterous and absurd to imagine.^(b) No: it cannot

^(b) Vindicating his church and country from similar accusations, that admirable patriot and exemplary pastor, Dr. Doyle, in his most powerful and most eloquent reply to Dr. Magee, says:—

“The Catholic Church is also loyal—but she is loyal through a sense of duty, and because such is the line of conduct prescribed to her by Almighty God. She is devoted to the prince established by divine Providence, not through fear or necessity, but freely and cheerfully; in every country, and under whatsoever circumstances, she offers up, as is prescribed by St. Paul, prayers and petitions for the king, and for all that are in high station, that all men may lead a quiet and holy life. To impugn the sincerity of her children in this country in praying for the monarch and bearing towards him the most sincere devotedness of

be, that we merit our exclusion, because we continue our submission, in doctrinal points, to the

mind and will, is one of the most unworthy deeds of which any person, lay or ecclesiastic, could be guilty.

“ The insinuations in the Charge respecting a division of allegiance, and the insecurity of that which we owe and pay to the sovereign of these realms, are SLANDEROUS and MALIGNANT. They are founded on no facts, supported by no proof; they are contradicted by every page of our history, by the preambles of divers acts of Parliament, by the statements of our friends, the confessions of our enemies, by the senate and the ministers of the king. I omit our own oaths of allegiance, which are incompatible with a division of allegiance, because I cannot submit to vindicate myself or my fellow-countrymen from the imputation of perjury. It is the grossest insult which men were ever condemned to endure.”

But, says the Bishop of St. Davids’, “ they [Roman Catholics] are incapable of the allegiance, which is due from subjects to their sovereign. My Lords, they *are* incapable of that allegiance, because they are bound by a contrary allegiance to a foreign sovereign.”—(*Speech of Dr. Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David’s*, delivered on the 9th July, 1823, and published by the Right Reverend prelate himself!!)

My only reply to Dr. Burgess is, that his assertion is *false, calumnious, and insulting*. But to what a condition are we reduced! we not only *swear* a true and perfect allegiance, but we swear it in much stronger terms than any Protestant in the kingdom, than the Bishop of St. David’s himself. That oath is framed by the legislature, is ac-

authority of the ancient Church of Christendom, instead of transferring it to one of more modern

cepted by the sovereign, and qualifies us for the service of the state. Yet, a peer of parliament is suffered with impunity, and in the face of the whole world, to impeach other peers of parliament, of bearing no true allegiance to their sovereign, *though the sovereign himself has ratified that allegiance by his acceptance of it*,—to accuse them of having called the Almighty to witness, that they would do that which they were incapable of doing,—in truth, to arraign them both of perjury and of treason,—of the highest crimes before God and man. Was ever outrage like this? But this, and much more than this, are we compelled to endure. This same Bishop of St. David's (since translated to the bishopric of Salisbury, doubtless for the merit of having composed the Catechism from which the following dogma is taken) emphatically avows, that, in his infallible judgment, no man can be a Protestant, whatever he may profess to be, who does not KNOW *it to be TRUE that the worship of the Church of Rome is idolatrous*. That the Bishop of St. David's should know that to be true of us, which *we know to BE FALSE* of ourselves—that he should SWEAR that to be true of us, which *we would swear to be false* of ourselves, is not so much to be wondered at, because....but even against the Bishop of St. David's, I will not condescend to employ the weapon of retaliation which he has thrust into my hand. But if his Protestantism depends upon *his knowledge of the truth of that WHICH IS POSITIVELY, AND ABSOLUTELY, AND NOTORIOUSLY FALSE*; and, if the *sincerity* of his allegiance is to be ascertained by his *abjuration of the spiritual authority of the head of the Christian Church*; I envy him

date; nor, because in a country in which a hundred different sects have found an unmolested

neither his principles as a Protestant, nor his profession of fidelity as a subject. But let us hear his own words :

Q. "What is Protestantism?"

A. "The abjuration of Popery, and the *exclusion* of Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil."

Q. "Is it any hardship on Protestants to make the declaration against Transubstantiation and the invocation of Saints?"

A. "No: Because if they are really Protestants, they are so, on this very principle, that the worship of the Church of Rome is unscriptural, superstitious, and idolatrous."

Q. "Is it any objection to the declaration, that many Protestants, who are called upon to make it, do not know enough of the subject to be satisfied of the truth of the declaration?"

A. "No: Because no one can be a Protestant on principle, who is *not* satisfied of the truth of the declaration, and if he is a Protestant in principle, there can be no hardship in making a declaration, which he *knows* to be true, and, as an avowed Protestant, he *professes* to believe."

Q. "Is it any objection to the declaration, that many Protestants, who are called upon to make it, do not consider the worship of the Church of Rome to be idolatrous, and may therefore think the declaration an unfounded calumny?"

A. "If they think the declaration an unfounded calumny, and hold the worship of the Church of Rome not to be idolatrous, they are not *Protestants*, whatever they may profess to be; and the objection does not apply to them."

footing, we choose to believe one code of religious tenets in preference to another ; nor because, in

Q. " Can we, then, consider the declaration as unnecessary, in respect of the Papists, or hard on Protestants ?"

A. " It is neither unnecessary as to the Papists, because the experience of the past shews that former laws were insufficient without it; nor can it be any hardship on the Protestants, because if they are Protestants, on principle, they *know* it to be true, and, as avowed Protestants, *profess* to believe it ; and which, if they do not believe, they belie their Protestant profession."

Q. " How may we co-operate with the laws for preventing the growth of Popery ?"

A. " By exposing the false pretensions, the errors, the evils, and the interests of Popery ; and by doing what the laws require us to do for its prevention."

Q. " What do the laws require us to do for this purpose ?"

A. " Certain solemn days are set apart for commemorating the plots and conspiracies of Popery against our Church, and our deliverance from them, &c."—(*The Protestant's Catechism*, by Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David's. Fourth Edit. pp. 216, 242, 250.

Now, if to our Catholic Catechisms, we were to attach the following Appendix, to edify our catechumens with a specimen of the Christian charity of a Protestant divine, we should only be delineating with accuracy the conduct and principles of many of our revilers, and exhibiting a true portrait of the Bishop of St. David's " Protestant's Catechism," painted with his own colours.

Q. What is Protestantism ?

A. The *abjuration* of Popery, and the *exclusion* Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil.

spite of calumny and proscription, we continue to profess a Christianity which has been the admira-

Q. How are we to abjure Popery?

A. By falsifying history*—by substituting the assertion of that which is false, under pretence that it is the proof of that which is true; by framing such fictitious doctrines for the Papists as they abhor and detest,—for their Church is so pure, that without this, we should have nothing to allege against them,—by calumny and misrepresentation in every shape and of every hue; by denying that which is true, and believing that which is false; by accusing Papists of crimes which they never committed, and punishing them for trespasses of which they never dreamt; by *swearing* that we *know* their doctrines to be superstitious and idolatrous, though they believe the same gospel that we do, and though they most solemnly aver that they hold superstition and idolatry in the same abhorrence and detestation as ourselves.

Q. How are we to *exclude* Papists from all *power* ecclesiastical or civil.

A. By tyranny, oppression, and injustice; by refusing them all civil rights; by declaring them to be incapable of fulfilling the duties of good subjects; by pretending that they desire to overthrow the constitution which they are so justly proud of having inherited from their ancestors—by carefully excluding them from that inheritance—by accepting of their services when we want them, and rejecting them, unrequited, when we have no farther need

* See *Examination of certain opinions of the Right Rev. Dr. Burgess, &c.*; Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*, p. 351, &c.

"Forgery—I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it, seems to be peculiar to the reformed—I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery."—*Dr. Whitaker.*

tion of all ages, and of all nations, and which is still the prevailing religion of civilized man.^(c) It

of them—by working them like beasts of burden in all hard, dangerous, and laborious occupations, and suffering true Protestants alone to be their task-masters—by keeping all the good things, both of this world and the next, for ourselves—by leaving nothing for Papists but poverty, misery, and exclusion for their treasons here, and damnation for their superstition and idolatry hereafter—by so exciting the execration of the whole country against them, that Englishmen shall again rank *Papistry* where it stood but a few years back in our Statute Book, with *treason* and *murder*.

Q. How may we co-operate with the laws for preventing the growth of Popery?

A. By the same means by which we are to abjure Popery, and to exclude Papists from all *power*, ecclesiastical or civil.

Q. What do the laws require us to do for this purpose?

A. Certain solemn days are set apart for worshipping the God of Charity and Truth with falsehood, calumny, and detraction upon our lips!!! (See the Service for the 5th of November in the *Book of Common Prayer*; and the real History of the Gunpowder Plot, in Lord Castlemain's *Catholique Apology* (1674), Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, and Lingard's *History of England*.)

^(c) Speaking of the religious belief of a Catholic, the faithful and elegant historian of his country, Dr. Lingard, says: "His belief is not the belief of a single nation, nor the growth of a few years. It is the belief of the great majority of Christians. It is, and for centuries has been, the belief of learned and polished nations; the belief of

cannot be, that, in this free and enlightened country, we are not equally at liberty with others, to enjoy the common prerogative of the Reformation, and to interpret Scripture at our will. There is no reason in such things. We must look to other causes, to account for that delusion of which we have been so long the victims; which imprints a stain upon our country; which makes us a byeword among the nations of the earth; and which converts the pride and glory we would gladly cherish, even as the degraded members of a free state, into feelings of shame and indignation. We consider ourselves, in common with a hundred millions of our Roman Catholic brethren in Europe,

scholars, philosophers, and divines; of generals, statesmen, and princes. Proudly as I may think of my own country, I cannot yet persuade myself that intellectual excellence is exclusively confined to this island; and when I look on the continent, and view the populous nations which there profess the Catholic faith—when I look back into past ages and behold millions of men, during a long series of generations, reckoning it as their pride and their happiness, I can smile at the invectives of its adversaries, and despise the disgrace which is heaped upon it here.”

“Catholicity, which has been this night the subject of so much abuse, has been the belief of the most extensive and enlightened nations in Europe; and of the most illustrious characters that ever did honour to the name of man.”—*Speech of Lord Hutchinson in the House of Lords, May 10, 1805.*

to possess as strong intellectual faculties, as clear a judgment, and as upright intentions, as any body of Protestants in the world: it is therefore the more wounding to our feelings to be treated as an ignorant, a worthless, and an unprincipled race, which we must be, if we are the just objects of the incapacities to which we are subjected by law,—and such as every member of the Legislature calls God to witness that he believes us to be,—the abettors of superstitious and idolatrous doctrines.

The Catholic Peer is defrauded of his hereditary rights; the Catholic commoner, of the opportunities which wealth or talent might afford him to serve his country, in situations of honour and of trust;—the professional man, of those objects of lawful ambition, which are the incentives and the rewards of a long life of toil and labour;—the freeholder, of the exercise of that qualification which is as dear to *him*, as the proudest distinction is to the most exalted personage;—ALL are deprived “of their fair chances in the lottery of life, and condemned hourly to the innumerable slights that wait upon political inferiority.”^(d) A painful sense

(d) “We take from them every object of honourable ambition; we doom them to the martyrdom, as far as our laws have power to inflict it, of popular scorn from the cradle to the grave; we leave them a separate class, without one public occupation or one aspiring hope, in the midst of a busy and ardent-spirited people.”—(Lord Nugent’s *Plain Statement*, &c.)

of implied criminality, which is more galling to a well-constituted mind, than any corporeal suffering," is constantly present to our imaginations; we carry the mark of Cain upon our forehead; we drink the waters of bitterness in our journey through the desert; and, though some of our fetters have been removed, the dishonourable traces which they imprinted, still remain, to bear false evidence against us.

We know it to be an incontestable truth, that the main edifice of the constitution of this country, was the work of Catholic valour, talent, and perseverance; and yet we are doomed to be strangers to its benefits; to hear the principle proclaimed and acted upon, every day, that Catholics are only known to the constitution for the purposes of pains and penalties;^(d) and that it is just and lawful to despoil us, in the land of our forefathers, of that sacred and glorious inheritance, which they so solemnly bequeathed, as his birth-right, to every free-born Englishman. We are worse than aliens in our native land, inasmuch as that an alien is under the protection of equal law, which we are not. If an alien be a

^(d) Witness, amongst others, the decisions, in 1825, of the Lords in council, upon the claims of the British Catholics for the restoration of their confiscated property, by which, though the money was actually paid by the Government of France, it was not permitted to reach its destination, under the plea that it would be employed in superstitious uses.

delinquent, or a presumed delinquent, he is entitled to a trial by his peers, and half of those peers are his own countrymen, and of his own religion; whereas, *our* delinquency, imaginary as it is, is tried by men who have no fellow-feeling with us, and who convict us, upon evidence, collected, produced, and attested by *themselves*. We are condemned to endure the stings of insult and calumny, frequently without either the opportunity of reply, or the hope of redress by law. We are denied the privilege of the meanest malefactor, that of being confronted with our accusers. We are excluded from the places in which the most galling and most influential of the calumnies pronounced against us are uttered; and, if we dare to answer them elsewhere, our calumniators may sit in judgment upon us, and punish our audacity with imprisonment!!

When the country calls forth the Roman Catholic in her defence, his blood flows as freely as that of his Protestant companion in arms; when our treasure is demanded, we give it in the same proportion as our more favoured fellow subjects: but, when we ask for the same rewards, the same honours, the same privileges, the same rights,—we are repulsed with reproaches, we are rejected, as the refuse of a state which, but for her Roman Catholic subjects, would long since have been annihilated. Yes, it was Catholic blood which kept the ark of the country afloat in the deluge of

perils from which we have but lately emerged, and in which, be it remembered, we may so soon be plunged again.^(e) What must be the natural consequences of such outrageous injustice, but to wean our affections,—not from our country,—for our country we must ever love and cherish, out of respect and veneration for the memory of our ancestors,—but from the government and institutions under which we are doomed to live?

But we are weary of proclaiming our grievances;—suffice it to say, that we are treated with an inhumanity and injustice, such as I hope clearly proves, (and for the honour of human nature be it spoken,) that our oppressors have neither any knowledge of us, or of our sufferings, of our principles, or of our services. We must look to other causes for such a state of things, than a mere love of oppression and cruelty in our rulers. It is ignorance and prejudice, faction and interest, which alone can uphold such a system of absurdity and tyranny. For faction and interest there can be no excuse, save the darkness with which these

^(e) If, previous to any one engagement during the late disastrous war, either by sea or land, the Catholic soldiers or sailors had been withdrawn, no victory would ever have been obtained. Without Irish bravery and Irish blood, neither Nelson nor Wellington had ever worn a laurel.

passions overspread the mind; neither is a voluntary and cherished ignorance less culpable in men, who use it as a weapon to inflict pains and penalties on millions of their innocent fellow subjects.—When an umpire is appointed to decide upon the most trivial affair between man and man, does he ever presume to do so, without a full and fair inquiry? Would he not consider it a flagrant injustice, to come to a decision upon partial or insufficient evidence? Yet here is a case, involving not only the well-being and prosperity of the whole empire, but, in a more intimate manner, affecting the rights, the properties, the reputation of seven millions of people, and yet both deliberative branches of the legislature, — almost without hesitation, certainly without adequate knowledge, or mature examination, pronounce a verdict of guilty. It is wholly impossible, it is utterly inconsistent with the exercise of their rational faculties, that they can have duly weighed and examined the question, and yet come to the decision which they do. The evidence is now so clear, so fully before the world, that whoever, in spite of it, should shut his eyes to the light of justice, we must pronounce to stand convicted of an inveterate hardening of the heart, and a palpable blinding of the understanding. We must then conclude, that it is only by ignorance and prejudice, by faction and interest, that men are governed in this matter.

My object, therefore, is, as far as my humble endeavours may extend, to warn the thinking portion of the community from being misled by those false and malignant spirits who are so busy to poison the public mind against us; who dress us up in a hideous garb, and put upon us all sorts of deformities of their own invention, till people believe us to be any thing but what, I trust, we really are. Still the injustice which we are doomed to suffer from ignorance and credulity, is that of which we have, perhaps, the most reason to complain, because it is the easiest to rectify.—While every other species of learning is pursuing a rapid and triumphant career—whilst the press teems, almost daily, with authenticated expositions of our doctrine—and whilst well-informed Catholics are to be met with at every corner, ready to give evidence of our faith,—is it not too much to be reduced to the alternative, of being either neglected as unworthy of attention, or of seeing our tenets and our conduct studied only in the writings of our adversaries?^(f) The errors of

^(f) “ I believe that there are few subjects on which so many opponents are to be met with, of that very numerous class who think themselves justified in feeling strongly without enquiring deeply, who acquiesce in unexamined statements merely to fortify their own preconceived sense of the case, and who are ever recurring to defences a thousand times overthrown, and now, by universal consent of all well-informed persons, abandoned, merely because the

the generality of mankind may, it is hoped, be extenuated, as arising from prejudices carefully

fact of the discomfiture and surrender may have escaped their not very extensive research, or may have lost its place in their not very impartial memory. This is a serious difficulty, because with such persons it is not easy to determine at what precise period of the controversy to begin. There is, however, another class with whom it is impossible to deal: the mere shouters of "No Popery;" those who, without the desire of enquiry, or the capacity of reasoning, think that they see their interest or their honour bound up in a determination never to doubt any early, or accidental, or careless, impressions, to which by habit they consider themselves pledged. Such we can only leave to rejoice in their own conclusions, unquestioned and undisturbed, withdrawing ourselves from all dispute with them as we should from the attempt to go through a proposition in mathematics with a person to whom the admission of an axiom appears to be matter of too hazardous generosity, and who accordingly, while expressing his readiness to listen to proof, feels that he owes it to his cause to refuse every preliminary concession on which a proof can by possibility turn. - Until they shall have done what they never will do,—until they shall have enlightened themselves on the history, not of their own country only, but of some other parts of modern Europe,—until they shall have learned what the penal laws were, and what they are now,—until they shall know the story and condition of the Roman Catholics in this empire, and of Protestants in others,—they must be content to be challenged as Jurors to pass upon this Question. Nay, more,

instilled into the infant mind, fostered through every stage of education, and perhaps matured by subsequent habits of indifference in religious matters, or at least by a neglect of all further enquiry; but for men who profess to make accurate research and profound study the basis of every opinion which they deliver to the world — men of reputed learning and of extensive literary fame — there can be no palliation, when, in the face of the strongest historical evidence, they are guilty of deliberately advancing the most gross and unfounded calumnies against their Catholic fellow-countrymen.

Amongst the many to whom these imputations apply, there is no one who offends more conspicuously than Dr. Southey. The glaring misrepresentations of Catholic history and Catholic doc-

—they must, till then, absolutely abstain from all customary expressions of vituperation against the Papists, on pain of convicting themselves of possessing less than they ought of common honesty, or less than most men would be thought to possess of common discretion." Lord Nugent's most excellent *Statement, &c. in Support of the Political Claims of the Roman Catholics*. Hookham, 1826.

The virulent abuse of that portion of the public press which is opposed to emancipation, as well in England as in Ireland, is an irritating and never-failing insult which we are daily condemned to endure, and is one of the most grievous of all our penal inflictions. As long as it is the support of that system which oppresses us, so long shall we be its victims; but the cause which produces it being removed, it will vanish with all our other disabilities.

trine in his "Book of the Church," though so ably exposed by Dr. Milner, Mr. Butler, and others, continue to glitter through every subsequent edition, and to diffuse their pestilential influence among the public, and that, too, at a moment when the most calm and unprejudiced consideration of the great question of the policy of establishing religious tests for the qualification to political privileges, is become necessary, certainly for the strength and stability of the country, and perhaps for the very existence of social order in the empire. The fact is now fully established by long experience and incontrovertible evidence, that no permanent peace and tranquillity can exist in Ireland under the present system of religious warfare and political oppression.^(g) Whatever, therefore, does not directly tend to advance that consummation so ardently desired by every friend of justice and humanity, and of the general prosperity of the State, cannot be too sincerely and too strongly deprecated. But what shall we say of him, who endeavours by the most extensive circulation of the most atrocious and most unfounded calumnies, not only to oppose a barrier to the tide of peace and good will which, sometime back, appeared

^(g) See Mr. Shiel's temperate but eloquent speech, on moving an Address to his Majesty on Lord Sidmouth's letter of the 23rd Sept. 1821, APPENDIX, No. v.

to be so happily setting in upon the country, but, by wounding and irritating the feelings of those who are already harrassed almost beyond endurance, as well as by alienating the friends of toleration by the false picture he draws of those whom they were endeavouring to relieve, thus augments a disunion which it should be the object of every honest man to close.

I will not weary the reader by citing the instances of some of the most ungenerous calumnies that ever appeared in print, but will refer him to pp. 7 and 14 of Milner's "Strictures on Dr. Southey's Book of the Church," and to pp. 214, 253, &c. 280. 284. 319, &c. of Mr. Butler's "Book of the R. C. Church," and to p. 49 of the "Memoirs of Capt. Rock."^(h) There he may behold a

^(h) It is astonishing that a work of such transcendant merit as this undoubtedly is, should have produced so little effect. But even unrivalled genius, allied with uncompromising patriotism, and shedding fresh brilliancy on the cause of Truth and Justice, is no match against interested bigotry. The fabrication here noticed by the admirable author of the "Memoirs of Captain Rock," was even too gross for Dr. Southey, who, on discovering his *mistake*, omitted it in his 2nd edition.

As to Dr. Southey's *Vindiciæ*, it is really too contemptible to notice, being a complete farrago of folly and misrepresentation, and only one slander defended by another; cajoling his readers with the most senseless trash, alto-

Christian author, under pretence of promoting the cause of truth, rehearsing the most unfounded and antiquated falsehoods, a thousand and a thousand times refuted, against infinitely the most numerous denomination of Christians in the world; and, in spite of the most incontestible evidence, he will see him so wedded to his error, so enamoured of his calumnies, as obstinately to adhere to the impositions which he seems so happy to drag forth from their merited oblivion, and once more to employ for the oppression of his fellow-countrymen and fellow Christians.

In the Protestant *Canton du Vaud*, in Switzerland, such is the tyrannical intolerance of the government, that the Catholic clergyman is not permitted, under pain of dismissal, to explain, even in private, the articles of his religion to any one of a different persuasion, who may apply to him for that purpose. This may, perhaps, well enough answer the object of insuring a monopoly to Protestantism; but, tyrannical as it is, it is a much more charitable scheme than that adopted by Dr. Southey, who, apparently with the same views, has done all in his power to contrive, not that the people of England should be kept in ignorance of

gether beneath the notice of any honourable mind, and the very publication of which is a stain upon the literature of the country.

Catholic doctrine, in *his* acceptation of the term, but that they should learn it only through the misrepresentations and calumnies of his "Book of the Church." However easily and triumphantly the calumniator may be refuted, the poison is diffused through a thousand channels through which the antidote never makes its way; and, like his fellow-labourer in the same vineyard, Dr. Tomline, he has never the justice to retract his errors, and disabuse his readers of the unworthy prejudices he has been the means of fostering in their minds against us. But, to speak truth, and to render justice, is not the object of the ascendancy faction; and, in violating both, they are acting upon the doctrines so falsely imputed to Catholics, of keeping no faith with heretics, and of sanctifying the means by the end, when the defence of their Church is in question.^(g)

^(g) "The furious men," says Dr. Doyle, "who now agitate this country, seem to know that the sword of the law could not have been drawn, or if drawn, could not have been wielded with such deadly effect against the holy and ancient religion of these islands, if that religion had not first been decried, abused, and maligned, until it appeared to the multitude a very moral monster. 'From the sole of it's foot,' like its founder, 'to the top of it's head, there was no soundness in it;' it was buffeted, abused, spit upon; it was covered with a mantle of derision; it was scourged and drenched with vinegar and gall; the waters of affliction entered into it's very soul; and it was when

Another example of extreme injustice towards his Catholic fellow-countrymen, is presented to us by the Bishop of Winchester ; that prelate ought certainly to have given himself the trouble of ascertaining that what he asserted was true, or he should have abstained from that assertion altogether. Ignorance, in a case like this, is no excuse ; no criminal escapes the punishment of the law, upon the ground that he knew not that he was infringing it. The Bishop has been guilty of a gross and unfounded calumny upon the Catholic world,^(h) and though he has been long called

thus disfigured by a clamorous rabble, and seemingly abandoned by God, that the bigots and the fanatics cried out to the agents of the law and of the sword—‘Away with it, away with it.’”—(*Reply to Dr. Magee.*)

I most earnestly recommend this little work to every dispassionate reader ; for argument and eloquence it stands unrivalled.

^(h) See the libel contained in Dr. Tomline’s “Life of Mr. Pitt,” stated and refuted in Mr. Butler’s “Book of the Roman Catholic Church,” p. 137 ;—a libel which charges us with doctrines subversive of civil government, and of every principle of civilized society and Christian morality ;—doctrines which we have over and over again refuted upon the most authentic evidence, and disclaimed upon oath. Such a libel would entitle any but a *proscribed* race to redress at law against such slander and defamation.

upon to prove his assertions, or to retract the slanders so detrimental to the happiness and prosperity of so many millions of his fellow-subjects,—though a Christian Bishop, bound by the common laws of morality to repair the injuries which he may inflict upon his neighbour, in his character and reputation,—yet finding that he is unable to accomplish the former, he has neither the charity, the justice, nor the magnanimity to do the latter.⁽ⁱ⁾

Controversy should always be conducted with the utmost moderation; all harsh and offensive expressions should be carefully avoided, and nothing advanced in the way of insolent triumph. But what is the controversy to which these rules apply? a calm discussion of the *arguments* bearing on the

(i) Since the above was written, the bishop has been summoned before the bar of Divine Justice, leaving behind him £200,000 as the fruit of his episcopal labours. What would William of Wykham have thought of this? or even his Protestant predecessor, Dr. Andrews? I do not hereby impute blame to the Bishop of Winchester, but notice the circumstance merely to show the injustice of that system of ecclesiastical discipline, which allows the surplus revenues of the church to be perverted from their true purposes of repairing and embellishing the temples of God, and of satisfying the necessities of the poor; thus imposing a tax upon the people for whose benefit those revenues were originally granted, equal in amount to the revenues so misappropriated.

question in debate,—accompanied with a sincere endeavour to elucidate the truth, and to avoid all irritating and irrelevant matter.—But how does the controversy of the Ministers of the Church of England with Roman Catholics, partake of this character? Instead of displaying the meek spirit of Christianity, it is full of rancour and malignity; instead of a calm, sober search after truth, it is a violent exposition of all the atrocious calumnies and falsehoods heaped upon us through three centuries of persecution.—It is, in fine, no controversy at all; but a marshalling of all sorts of acrimonious invective, in the face of the strongest historical evidence, and often in absolute contradiction to the principles of those who impugn us.—Can the laws of fair controversy be applicable to such a system, (for a mere system it is become,) which vilifies and calumniates Catholics, in order to preserve the monopoly of political privileges now in possession of Protestants.—In mere matters of opinion in religion, much diversity is permitted, and must necessarily exist: in matters of faith and of fact, much discussion may sometimes be necessary, to dispel the darkness in which obscure and uninformed writers may have involved them, and to remove the difficulties with which prejudice and impiety may have encumbered them:—but to take up accusations which come only from adversaries, to receive every fact, with the distortions put upon

it by calumny, is to play the character of a partizan who carries on a warfare for the purposes of destruction, and who thereby places himself out of the protection of the law, and is, as it were, only to be repelled by force.

What, I will ask, can be dearer to an Englishman than his constitutional rights, rights secured (I cannot say to *him*) but to the *Protestant* subjects of this nation, by his Catholic ancestors, the wise and spirited framers of Magna Charta, of trial by jury, and the representative system? and what can be more iniquitous than to defraud him of those rights, because Dr. Southey chooses to call him idolatrous and superstitious. Let Dr. S., and his coadjutors in the work of libel, if they have not the generosity to do us justice by advocating the cause of truth, at least cease their calumny; and in a very short time prejudice will subside, bigotry will resign her sway, and the triumph of civil and religious liberty will be, at length, achieved.

The last debate upon the Catholic question furnished a lamentable instance of misrepresentation in a quarter from which it was least expected. It was asserted, with much parade of solemn and momentous accusation against the most unimpeachable prelacy in the world, that they cancelled a precept from the Decalogue; and it was at least insinuated, that they did so in order to flatter their favorite propensities to Idolatry. Mr. Peel, for

this purpose, quoted from an abridgment of our catechism, in which, as a purely elementary work, the heads only of each commandment are given, when he could easily have found a hundred others in which they are recited at full length; one even being produced in the house that very night. As to the ridiculous charge of curtailing the commandments, by dividing them as we do, it is utterly without foundation. We give the first and second together, and divide the last into two. The consequence is, that in an abridgment, the heads only being given, what Protestants consider the second commandment is omitted; but then it must be remembered that this second commandment is merely an explanation of the first, and necessarily comprised in it in substance. It is astonishing that a man of Mr. Peel's character and reputation for fair dealing, should condescend to use misrepresentation when he finds argument fail him. But it only shews the extent of his delusion, and how fitted his mind is to receive impressions contrary to truth, reason, and common sense, when his favourite prejudices are to be cherished. If that delusion only affected the individual, we should lament it, without presuming to correct him; but when the delusion of an individual stands between the happiness of millions, and that individual is the champion of a party opposed to the best interests of the empire, then indeed it is a

delusion which ought to be exposed to the whole world.^(m)

(m) “ We know that the Decalogue consisted of *ten commandments*; we find in it *fourteen precepts*; the question is, how they are to be reduced into the ten classes which form the ten commandments. In the Hebrew and other oriental versions, and in the early Vulgates, there is no classification of the ten commandments: how they should be classed, was an early subject of dispute in the Christian Church. St. Augustin recommended the classification now used by the Catholic Church: from his time till the Reformation, it was generally adopted. The early reformers made a new division of the precepts, by separating the first commandment from the second, and blending the ninth and tenth into one; but the Decalogue remained the same.

“ This was fully explained by *Dr. Lingard* on the *Durham Controversy*, and by the *Irish Prelates* in the examinations before the *Committee on Irish Affairs*. How then can the charge be now gravely made?”—*Extract from the Catholic Miscellany for May, 1827.*

“ In the division of the Decalogue, the Christian Churches are *not* agreed. That of England, and the whole of the Calvinists, with Josephus, make two distinct precepts of verses 8 and 7, Exodus, xx.; whereas, the Roman Catholics, and the Lutherans, divide *with* Saint Austin, and make *one* commandment, of what the former make *two*; but to keep the number of ten, they split what, in the other division is deemed the ninth. Every one who looks into Walton’s Polyglott may see that the command not to make *sculptilia*, *neque omnem similitudi-*

I will cite another illustration in point, both as a proof of the blind fury of our opponents, and of the ignorance to which it is to be attributed, and as enabling me to present to the reader an eloquent and argumentative appeal to his fellow-countrymen, from my valued friend and relative the present secretary to the British Catholic Association.—See APPENDIX, No. I.

Neither can I refrain from referring the reader to another and a very flagrant instance of misrepresentation, from the mouth of a distinguished member of the upper House, which, though of ancient date, I consider to be of very considerable importance, as tending to exemplify the dispositions of mind of those individuals in the legislature, who have so long succeeded in making us the victims of their delusion.—See APPENDIX, No. V.

nem, &c. neque adorare ea, is retained in the Latin Vulgate; and surely, as to the division, it is of so *little* importance, that we may *wonder* it ever could beget a *controversy*. In the English church not a single word is said about the interdict to the Jews against making or worshipping graven images. Nor, through the whole of our Catechism, is there *any caution* introduced against the *practice* of the *Church of Rome*. I am not then warranted in arraigning the sincerity of the Roman belief, or the uprightness of their intentions, at all events. I should be ASHAMED of urging against them any FALSE *accusations* of disingenuous *omission*, or unauthorized arrangement in the Decalogue.”—*Parr’s Characters of C. J. Fox*, vol. ii. page 129.

EMANCIPATION is no longer a question between two parties in the state :⁽ⁿ⁾ it is a question between two nations ;—one struggling for its liberties,—the other endeavouring to rivet the chains of slavery and oppression. This is a contest going on, and which will go on, in the very heart of the British empire, and between two people not very unequally balanced, in either physical or moral force ; and is it to be supposed that this struggle is never to pro-

⁽ⁿ⁾“ This question had, within the last twenty years, risen from a state of comparative insignificance to one of paramount importance. It was now the question of the empire ; the question which divided the people as well as the Parliament ; a question which had not only divided, but had broken up, and would break up, Cabinets and Administrations. Look at the effects of the Penal Laws in this country ; they had destroyed that friendly intercourse and those social habits which were, perhaps, not less essential to private and domestic comfort, than to the well-being of the community at large. They kept up a perpetual excitation and ferment in the public mind—they rendered property insecure—they prevented the introduction of capital sufficient to develope the great and hitherto dormant resources of this fine and fertile country. And to their operation alone could be attributed those occasional bursts of public commotion, which are produced by rapacity and oppression on the one hand, and by poverty and despair on the other.”

(Extract from Lord Killeen's excellent speech at the public dinner, lately so deservedly given to that patriotic nobleman, by the friends of civil and religious liberty.)

duce any thing but angry murmurs, and irritated feelings?^(k)

^(k) Nothing can be finer than the present dispositions of the whole Irish people. Mankind never exhibited a more noble instance of zeal tempered with discretion; and of suffering sanctified by patience. God grant that such dispositions may last as long as the occasion which produces them! But their own history, and the history of the whole world tells us, and *warns* us while it tells us, that there are circumstances beyond which patience will not endure, and tyranny will goad on to desperation. May heaven avert so dreadful a calamity! The following prayer, proffered by a whole nation smarting under a cruel and unjust infliction, is a noble and decisive answer to the calumnies of our enemies, and a sublime panegyric upon the religion of the people who offer it:—

“ O Almighty and most merciful God, in whose hands are the hearts and designs of men; prostrate before thy altar, we humbly and earnestly beseech thee to look down with an eye of pity upon the long continued sufferings, the unmerited privations, and severe legal enactments, under which the Catholic population of these realms are still unrelentingly doomed to complain. Our own individual transgressions against thy law, have, doubtless, justly drawn down upon us those heavy inflictions. Against the state, however, we have not transgressed. An inviolable attachment to the faith once delivered to the saints, is the only state crime we can be charged with—that unchangeable faith, professed at this day by the great majority of thy Christian people; but such fidelity to thy sacred deposit, instead of being criminal in thy sight, O Lord,

When every other nation in Europe, in which a difference of religion exists, has cemented its power, and concentrated the affections of its people, by the most enlarged system of religious toleration, it is certainly most extraordinary that we, who pretend to be the wisest and the most liberal of all, should alone continue a policy, which divides instead of uniting, which irritates instead of con-

furnishes us on the contrary, we firmly hope, with a stronger claim upon thy mercies. Thou hast declared those blessed who shall suffer persecution for justice sake. We are now suffering for it. We are suffering, and alas! have long suffered, with patience, under the influence of religion, as our ancestors have suffered.—They have generously preferred thy law, O Lord, to every earthly consideration; their example, we trust, has not been unavailing; and with thy divine assistance we are fully determined never, upon any account, or under any penal pressure whatsoever, to relinquish any one article of our holy religion. Graciously hear us, then, O merciful God; vouchsafe, in thy infinite goodness, to enlighten our Sovereign, his Ministers, and the British Legislature; that they may at length more justly appreciate our ill-requited fidelity, and adopt such prudent and wholesome councils as will unite every denomination of our fellow-subjects in one general bond of mutual charity, unshaken loyalty, and universal peace; thus securing the stability of the throne, and effectually promoting the happiness of the people: through Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end. Amen.”

ciliating, and which weakens where it ought to strengthen.—That, in England alone,^(l) that far-famed garden of liberty, the baneful weed of intolerance should flourish in such rank luxuriance ;—in England, where a hundred different religions have found their way, and where there is no limit to the intrusion of new ones,—that *one* religion alone should be proscribed, and *that* the mother of the religion of the state, the foundress of all her institutions, and the nurse of all her liberties, is an enigma which no ingenuity can solve, unless we put it down as the effect of consummate bigotry. Our intolerant legislators of England, like the former *noblesse* of France, are endeavouring to continue their monopoly of privileges, at the risk of subverting the social institutions of the country, and of dismembering the empire.^(m) And this is

(l) Even Italy and Spain are no exceptions to the present happy diffusion of religious freedom throughout the world; for, in those countries, there are no Protestants. If there were, there can be no doubt but they would be treated with the same liberality, justice, and equality, which they now experience in every other Catholic state; whereas a British subject, *being a native of these Islands*, is the only individual upon earth, upon whom the profession of Catholicity is a penalty and a reproach.

(m) Another and striking instance of such a disposition is to be found in the obstinate refusal of the House of Peers to make any efficient amendment in the present

the end to which the enemies of Great Britain are so anxiously looking.—In France it was said, (however absurd the idea,) that the defeat of the bills for our relief, in 1825, was owing to a combined scheme of the Jacobins of both countries, who, foreseeing that the settlement of this great question would for ever consolidate the power of England, were therefore determined to exert themselves for its discomfiture.—To attach credit to this idea, a report was circulated, and which was actually used as an argument against the measure, by at least one member of the House of Commons, that the main object of the Catholics was the restoration of the forfeited property, now in the hands of both clergy and laity. This opinion was much strengthened by the indemnity granted to a class of men, somewhat similarly circumstanced with the dispossessed Irish. Others attributed the defeat of the

disgraceful state of the game laws ; laws which are rapidly converting the whole country into one great arena of crime, and producing consequences at which every mind must shudder. The fate of the last bill on this subject was a complete burlesque on legislation. After the question had been vehemently agitated for many years—after repeated attempts and repeated failures—after fighting its way with extreme difficulty to a certain point, its ephemeral success was suddenly arrested by the magic power of *seven* noble lords ; the division being, content six, non-content, seven !!!

measure, or, in other words, the blind intolerance of the majority of the House of Peers, (to which we must unfortunately now add that of the House of Commons,) to the secret agency of the Holy Alliance, which aims at nothing more sincerely than the humiliation of England; and which seeks an example, in the tyrannical conduct of *our* government towards her Catholic subjects, for the slavish principles by which *they* are guided towards their own people, and the whole world. This opinion, in its turn, was strengthened by the happy allusion to this view of the case, in the manly, convincing, and brilliant speech of the ever-to-be-lamented and intrepid Canning; a speech which has endeared and immortalized his memory, in the heart and mind of almost every Catholic in the empire.— On the other hand, the *liberals*, who looked to nothing but the well-being of both countries, lamented, most sincerely, the failure of this great covenant of conciliation, not only because it was a sad example of tyranny, but because it might, at no distant period, serve as a precedent for their own government to enact a series of penal statutes against the Protestants of France, under the plausible pretence of disaffection to the reigning dynasty. In this view of the question, they were supported by the sometimes misguided zeal of the present royal family, and by the well-known fact, that the Protestants were never sincerely attached to any

government that has ever ruled in France, save that of Napoleon. Thus, in whatever point of view it was considered, it was looked upon as a policy fraught with evil of the blackest dye.—Napoleon is reported to have said; *La famille des Bourbons est la plus intolérante de la terre*: however this may have been, it is certainly not so now; the present king of France,⁽ⁿ⁾ with all his zeal for Catholicity, having given full security to his dissenting subjects, by swearing in his coronation oath, (and it presents rather an extraordinary contrast,) to give equal rights to his Protestant *thousands*, while the king of England, upon a similar occasion, is supposed by some to swear eternal proscription against his Catholic *millions*.^(o)

⁽ⁿ⁾ Compare the late speech of the King of France with that of the King of England, and if we do not blush at the contrast, the spirit of Englishmen is not in us.

Compare also the oath required of a legislator in France with the Test exacted amongst us. While a Frenchman swears allegiance to his king, fidelity to the constitution, and a determination to do his duty to his country—an Englishman is thought better qualified for the functions of a senator, by swearing a libel on millions of his fellow-subjects, and proscription against an extinct and departed race. For the performance of his duty to his country, no pledge is required of him; but unless he *knows* and swears a Catholic to be an idolator, he can have no pretensions to legislative wisdom or integrity.

^(o) It is a very singular circumstance, and highly worthy of remark, that precisely at the same moment at which

And what, in the event of the continuance of this system of proscription, is to be the ultimate fate of these *millions*? With the prospect of England before them, happy, prosperous, and tranquil, (that is, seen as it appears to *them*) because governed by equal laws, and in the possession of equal rights,—shall they be condemned to gaze for ever upon this blooming land of promise, and yet be always doomed to linger in the desert? Are they to be eternally consigned to pauperism, and coerced by military law? Are they to be always told, that they are unworthy to be received as members of the state; that to participate in the general prosperity of the commonwealth, is too great a blessing for them?—that they shall be for ever accounted as aliens and outcasts,—that their only inheritance shall be, from one generation to

the government of Catholic France is driven from its post, because it is not liberal enough, the ministers of Protestant England are removed from the councils of their sovereign, because they are too liberal for the age!! For this, after all, seems to be the truth.—Neither may it be unfair to observe, that, while the Catholic hierarchy of France have lately displayed their wisdom and virtue, by refusing the political privileges with which their sovereign was desirous of investing them, there is no instance upon record in which the Protestant hierarchy of England have ever evinced a distaste for the power and possessions which have fallen to their lot.

another, to be hewers of wood and drawers of water? —Oh! the shame and the disgrace of England, to allow her bigotry to place her in such a situation, that perhaps the best and only hope of one third of her people, shall be to look for the weakness and humiliation of their oppressors:—for the day of England's prosperity, has never yet been a day of grace or justice to Ireland. The hour of atonement, however, has not yet past.^(p) In the name of heaven, let it not be neglected.—May the timely

^(p) Neither is the degrading system carried on in Ireland, under the name of *Reformation*, likely to mend the matter; a system of immoral, unprincipled, and corrupting persecution, practised upon a half-starved population, “beginning with the child in the cradle, and only ending with the aged and forlorn, upon the bed of death.”—Good God! where have these lords and ladies, prelates and parsons, these Apostles of Ireland's reformation, where have they learned that charity consists in bribing a man to perjury and apostacy—to sell his birth-right for a mess of pottage—to commit crimes that cry to heaven for vengeance, and lose his soul for the sake of saving a starving body for a few years of misery and infamy! We see that these, and these only, are the fruits of this fanaticism, since every day brings back these converts of the Reformation; not one in twenty remaining obstinate in his apostacy. But the people of England know little or nothing of all this. Almost all that the London papers ever tell us of Ireland, is, that a riot or a murder has been committed, and that numerous and notable conversions are daily made to Protestantism: but any, who will take the trouble to inform

and happy settlement of this great question (in common with other important amendments in our sys-

themselves, through the medium of the Irish papers, will see how false and exaggerated are the statements made in England.—How much more good might Parliament do, by spending a few thousands a year in a liberal system of education in Ireland, than by lavishing the same sums in *charter-school grants*, on the principle of excluding the great body of the people from the benefits of education.

Do they think to achieve, by such means as these, what the long continued efforts of the most horrible system of destruction that ever disgraced the character of civilized man, were incapable of accomplishing? History, “which is philosophy teaching by example,” tells us, that the monsters whom regenerated England employed to govern Ireland, have mown down whole generations of Papists at a stroke, ravaging the field with fire and sword, in the hopeful expectation that a harvest of Protestants would arise;—when lo and behold! in lieu of Protestantism, Popery springs up again,—but only to be cut down once more, and to be cast again into the fire. Still the crop of Protestants never once grew up: the land was obstinate and intractable; and, in spite of every new system of experimental cultivation, has continued as barren of Protestantism, and as fertile of Popery, ever since. Practically convinced of the utter vanity of their attempt, let them at length rather endeavour to make them good and faithful subjects, than bad and dangerous Christians.

The Catholics, who are styled the enemies of education, oppressed and impoverished as they are, have at this moment 420,000 children under tuition, in schools established and supported by *voluntary* contribution; and happy I am to say, that many liberal and humane Pro-

tem of government) cement together every portion of the empire, in eternal union, and elevate us higher upon the pinnacle of glory, happiness, and prosperity, than any Christian nation has ever yet attained to.

God knows how far we are from such a situation at present! And amongst the numerous evils that afflict us, there is none greater than the miserable condition of Ireland, which will, in part, be seen in the following extract from a printed circular, dated Mansion House, Dublin, Jan. 17, 1828.

“ The present distressed and impoverished state of the country having given occasion to the con-

testants have most handsomely seconded their exertions by grants of land, as well as of money;* and, in return, the children of Protestants are educated indiscriminately with Catholics, and this without any attempt at proselytism, the religious instruction being given separately. Many of these schools are supported by a religious order of lay brothers, not uncommon upon the continent, but lately introduced into Ireland by Dr. Doyle and other prelates. The sole intent of this society is the education of the poor, and those who are not engaged in teaching, maintain themselves by manual labour; yet all assistance from Government is refused *them*, while large sums are lavished upon places where, when a school-house is erected, no scholars can be found to occupy it.

* The Duke of Devonshire is a noble example of liberality in this respect, having lately, amongst a hundred other similar donations, given an acre of land and six hundred pounds, to erect a Catholic Chapel, at Dungarvon. *Felix faustumque sit, tam donanti quam accipienti!*

vening of a public meeting in this city, in order to devise measures for endeavouring to avert the consequences that *must* result from its continuance, &c. &c., I hope that your presence and influence will not be wanting on this occasion to aid in devising and promoting such measures as shall be deemed most effectual towards rescuing the country from its present *alarming* condition, and for rendering its resources available towards the improvement of the great body of the people, and the prosperity of the empire at large.”—Such was the *alarming* condition of Ireland on the 17th of January, yet on the 29th it was wholly unknown to his Majesty’s ministers. For it is not to be supposed that such a state of things should be known to exist, and yet no notice be taken of it in the speech from the throne. As if foreboding inefficacy to their prayers, instead of applying to parliament for assistance in their distress, and appealing to the wisdom and good feeling of the legislature, they seem to throw themselves in despair upon the charity of individuals! Parliament has devised one scheme of emigration after another—has expended thousands in charter-school grants, and thousands in the draining of bogs; but misery still reigns predominant, and threatens, as it would appear, the very existence of the country. But parliament is to do no more: the efforts of individuals are to supply those of the great council of the nation. The administration

of public affairs is to be a sinecure in regard to Ireland. She is to be abandoned in her greatest need to the frantic reign of Bible Societies, of reformation crusaders, and perjured conspirators. She is to be given over to a malevolent faction, which "like a raging lion, goeth about seeking whom it may devour;" which not only preys, but gorges upon it's victims; a faction against which innocence is no protection, and a verdict of *not guilty* is no acquittal: and to brighten her prospects for the future, her avowed and determined enemies are placed at the head of the Government in England! Good God! when will the folly of our rulers cease? They drive the people into misery by a long continued system of mal-administration, and then insult and mock them in their afflictions by the most obstinate and contemptuous silence. It is both sending them the sword, and giving them the arm to wield it!^(g) Till the Catholic peasant be taught to regard the law as his protector, by finding himself on an equality with his Protestant neighbour—till all cause of irritation be removed, and the spirit of bigotry be laid, by rescinding all penal distinctions—no permanent tranquillity can be expected; and till tran-

^(g) When Scanderberg sent his sword to Mahomet II. at the request of that monarch, Mahomet returned it, saying, that though he had sent him his scymetar, he had not sent him the arm that wielded it.

quillity be established on a solid basis, to invite the investment of capital for the employment of the people, Ireland will be poor, and wretched, and miserable. It is a well known fact, that, during the discussions upon the Catholic claims, in 1825, very large sums of money were only waiting for the security which the final settlement of that great question would afford, to be immediately embarked for Ireland. It has probably been lent to Mexico, and been lost ; for in the present situation of things, our surplus capital finds a readier channel for investment in the remotest corners of the world, and upon the most shallow security, than in calling into action the fertile but latent resources of our own immediate provinces. Those yearly droves of ragged and hungry Irish peasants—a faint portrait of the still greater misery they leave behind—who traverse the country in search of a precarious subsistence, ought to speak more feelingly to the minds of Englishmen than they do. In wretchedness they outvie those “ Papists of the East,” the very Greeks themselves, without being equally fortunate in attracting the compassion or goodwill of the nation. The Greek dies nobly in the field, and his death is sweetened with the compassionate regard of the whole civilized world—while the victim of English bigotry, pines out a miserable existence, or sinks under the slow but deadly poison of disease and famine,

with scarcely a heart to lament him.^(r) If we steel ourselves to every sentiment of compassion for the sufferings of Ireland, as they regard *herself*, let our own interests, at least, excite us to reflect upon the consequences to *us*. In proportion as Ireland is poor, so will England be the victim of that poverty. Hitherto the voice of Ireland has been heard only in the distance; she now comes in person to tell us of her afflictions; she sends forth her people like swarms of locusts upon the land, to devour and to make sterile: wherever she bends her course, famine and misery are attendants in her train; the original proprietors are dispossessed, or sink to the same level of wretchedness with the miserable intruders. Such has frequently been the result, to a greater or a less extent, in all those districts which have been more immediately the rendezvous of the Irish emigrants; the poor rates having, in many instances, absolutely exceeded the whole rental of the property on which they were levied. Though the consequences to other parts

(r) It is not intended to depreciate the generosity of, perhaps, a large portion of the *people* of England, in the succour they have so often given to arrest the ravages of famine amongst the poor of Ireland. The hand of individual charity has been bountiful, and has met with a proportionate return of gratitude. But, as a nation, we perpetuate those scenes of misery by blinding ourselves to their causes, and while we apply the balsam with one hand, we open the wound again with the other.

of the kingdom have been less perceptible, they have been every where real and considerable. The evil is one which, under the present system of government in Ireland, must not only exist, but must necessarily increase; and who shall say whether it will terminate before the whole of England be consigned to the same dreadful condition of miserable poverty, to which she has so woefully contributed to reduce that unhappy country? It is now nearly a month, since the distressed and impoverished state of Ireland has rendered her condition *alarming*; and though this has been officially announced for the same period, it does not yet appear to have attracted the notice of the legislature, or even of the English journals. Really to judge from the contents of our public press, the details of a fashionable party, the birth of some unnatural monster among the animal creation, or even the flowering of a primrose in January, is of more importance to the people of England, than are the most vital interests of the sister island, the possession of which has alone elevated us above the rank of secondary nations, by furnishing us with almost unlimited resources—by supplying half our navy, and more than half our army.

I hope a few words may be permitted me (and I speak them with all due respect) to the Right Rev. Bench of Bishops—Gratitude alone should induce them to act differently from what they do; for they have certainly never yet repaid the obligation

under which they were placed by the votes of the 26 Catholic Peers, who in 1661, united in restoring them to their seats in the Legislature (from which the persecuted sectaries had driven them,) nor requited the good offices they had previously received from the Catholic Peerage in 1641. No greater proof than these facts present, can be given of the sincerity of those professions which we make, in case of justice being done us, to rank ourselves amongst the constitutional supporters of the established church; and yet, she opposes emancipation, to secure her temporalities! One while, she argues that Catholics will thrive so fast on freedom, that they will overrun the whole empire. If so, Protestantism, deep-rooted as it is, must indeed be a meagre plant, to be expelled the soil by a new half-starved comer. Others say, the Catholics thrive well enough as it is. True: they do so: they gain in wealth, in numbers, in importance daily; and, in proportion as they thrive, so do they become more discontented with their political situation.—Every day, their condemnation weighs more heavily upon them; the object which they seek becomes of more value, in proportion to their increasing capacity to enjoy it; and every day their exertions will be redoubled, with the power they possess, towards obtaining the redress of their grievances, and the objects of their lawful ambition. In any case, emancipation must and will be achieved, and better in peace and quiet, than in war and

tumult—better in the day of prosperity, than in the hour of distress. Thank heaven! the time is past when the system of persecution by which we are oppressed, was pursued to its full extent; but though its power is broken and enfeebled, its spirit is not yet fled. We still suffer directly in our privileges and our rights, and even in our fortunes;^(*) while our reputation, both as subjects and as Christians, is still loaded with the defamation of nearly three centuries. If the state seeks for defence in such measures, it cannot find it: it is only erecting a barrier against its best friends. If the Church looks for support from such weapons, she only combats against herself, by alienating the good opinion of those who would otherwise be sincere in protecting her.

The Protestant is now the Established Church. Let her rest satisfied with this advantage. It gives her all the splendour, and power, and influence of worldly state, with the largest ecclesiastical revenues in Christendom to support them; thus insuring her as complete an ascendancy over every other religion as can with justice be desired. But

(*) Witness the *double* land-tax.—I am most happy in this opportunity of publicly testifying the sense which the Catholics of England must ever entertain of the very handsome manner in which Mr. Banks has come forward to relieve his fellow-countrymen from this very oppressive and unjust grievance.

if her prelates and ministers provoke the exposure of her errors—of the false principles on which she separated from the Church of Rome—and of the iniquity in which she was cradled, by calumniating the religion of those whom they have dispossessed, and by continuing against them a system of unmerited condemnation, as well as against all who dissent from them; *they themselves* are answerable for the consequences. The firebrand with which they are still desolating the victims of their bigotry and their fears, may be hurled back into their own quarters, and the golden harvest which they are now reaping in such plenty, may be blasted and destroyed for ever!

The Church of England should ever recollect, that she has already once fallen in conflict with her enemies; and perhaps it would be well for the Sovereign to remember, that the monarch fell too: she has seen her hierarchy destroyed, her benefices usurped, and her religion reduced in its turn to the melancholy condition of a persecuted sect.⁽¹⁾ And is she not fearful of a second contest?

(1) "I went to London," says Evelyn, in his Memoirs, "to receive the blessed Sacrament, the first time the Church of England was reduced to a chamber and conventicle, so sharp was the persecution. The parish Churches were filled with sectaries of all sorts, blasphemous and ignorant mechanics usurping the pulpits every where.

Can she hear that one half of her followers have deserted, and not tremble lest they should raise the standard against her? Is it not folly—is it not madness, to learn these tidings, and not cease to irritate and offend? While she has yet the power to give—before she loses the ability to refuse, let her shew herself worthy of her cause, by her generosity, her justice, and her wisdom: let her doff the blood-stained armour of persecution, and clothe herself in the spotless garments of clemency and moderation, and, like a meek and humble disciple of Christ, let her meet her enemies with the kiss of peace, and inscribe on her standards, *GOOD WILL TO ALL MEN*. Clemency and moderation will attach a large and zealous body to her interests. We should support her,—not as a church possessing purity of doctrine, but as a teacher of good morals, and as a member of the great edifice of the constitution. Conciliation is her best and only resource: let her desist from her miserable and petty persecution of the dissenters, and her vigorous and determined warfare against the Catholics. This would place her on a proud pre-eminence, and be unto her a

Dr. Wilde preached in a private house in Fleet-street, where we had a great meeting of zealous Christians, who were generally much more devout and religious, than in our greatest prosperity.”

tower of strength; and if ever hereafter, in the vicissitudes of things, it should be her fate to fall, she would at least fall with honour and regret; at present she would meet her ruin unmerited and unlamented; and as long as the question be, whether the Church of England shall perish, or seven millions of the king's subjects be emancipated from civil thralldom, we shall not hesitate to exclaim, *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.*^(u) As the established religion, like the Greek schism, began by a simple act of separation, so, saving this exception, has she deviated less widely from the parent church than any other, and so, in proportion, will she find the professors of the ancient faith more ready and willing to defend her, when they can do so with advantage to the country, and with honour to themselves: they are now the most numerous of her enemies, and may be easily transformed into the most powerful of her friends. But if she is obstinately determined not to do us justice, at least

^(u) "What is it but the consciousness of injustice, or the innate weakness and inconsistency of any church, which can require in the present times that she be fenced in with laws and terrors, and rendered secure, not by her own truth and virtue, but by the oppression and humiliation of those who refuse to bow down and worship her like some golden calf. Let the church perish that thrives by oppression, and visits with temporal penalties the consciences of men!!"—(*Reply to Dr. Magee.*)

let her cease to make us the victims of calumny and misrepresentation; for it is calumny and misrepresentation alone that have reduced us to what we are. As credulity is one of the prevailing weaknesses of human nature, it is no wonder that the unjust accusations of our enemies should have been so successful in deceiving;—that while our religion remains pure and untainted as when it emanated from the revelations of heaven, it should be condemned by the credulous and the ignorant as superstitious and idolatrous;^(x)—and that though we remain as loyal members of the state as when we enjoyed our inheritance in full, we should be regarded as the disaffected and ill-omened of the creation. It is through interested defamation working upon extravagant fears, that we have been brought to *this*, that almost all who speak of us, deride and insult us—all who write of us, calumniate us—all who read of us, or hear of us, imbibe the poison, and reject the truth. How many, by the abuse of Catholicity, have paved their road to prefer-

(x) See a few specimens of the hideous calumnies in vogue against us, in the 32nd Letter of *The End of Religious Controversy*; calumnies which have reached the cottages of the poor as well as the houses of the rich, and which no one can read without blushing to belong to the religion of the men who propagated them, or to the society of Christians who receive and believe them: they are still to be met with in almost every publication of the day.

ment both in church and state; and have found ample gain in so disgraceful a traffic. How many prelates have forfeited the title of CHRISTIAN by their anti-christian illiberality? How many statesmen have abandoned their dignity and honour by prostituting their talents in the cause of cruel and unjustifiable oppression! But at the same time that we find many to condemn, it is a pleasure to find others to commend. How illustrious are those many virtuous and patriotic senators, who have scorned to be any thing but the honest advocates of religious toleration;—how benign amongst his colleagues is that venerable member of the Prelacy, who, in the true spirit of a Christian bishop, has ever known how to unite charity and benevolence with a dissent in religious tenets—who is now calmly journeying to the grave, eminent in wisdom and virtue, and who, when he is removed from amongst us, will perhaps leave Charity to seek in vain for another associate amongst the hierarchy of the establishment.^(y) Would to God

^(y) That charitable and benevolent individual, who a few years ago so laudably signalized his zeal, and exerted his talents in the cause of religious unity and peace, also bears most ample and liberal testimony in our favour. “By the reflecting members of the Church of England,” says this amiable writer, “who consider themselves a second branch of the Catholic church of Christ, the Church of Rome has

that such truly Christian sentiments as this amiable prelate has always professed, were common among his Protestant brethren; but the reverse is too generally the case; their judgment is distorted by prejudice, and their charity is converted into rancour by the force of falsely conceived opinions both in regard to us and to themselves. They weigh with impartiality every thing but Catholicity. They see others in their true colours, but

never been denied to be of the true church:" and again, "There is among the Roman Catholics a fixedness in their religious principles which will have influence; there is a decided attachment to their faith, which comprises all the genuine doctrines of the gospel; and amidst the sad diversity and alarming indifference generally prevailing among Protestants, some consolation may be derived from a hope, that in reward for the zealous affection of Roman Catholics for their religion, that respectable and numerous body may, under divine providence, become purified from error, and be the honoured means of conveying the true faith to the remotest generations."

"I am pained," says the late Dr. Parr, "by the outrageous invectives that are thrown out against the Church of Rome; and I must further confess that they appear to me not only unjust, but even inhuman."—"I hope," he says in another place, "to find a better way of showing myself either worthy to live, or fit to die, within the pale of the Church of England, than by insulting Roman Catholics with the opprobrious imputations of superstition and idolatry."

they look at Catholics only through a jaundiced medium. They fasten the crimes of individuals upon the whole body, and the virtues which they are sometimes forced to admit and to admire, they confine to individual merit. Thus, whether we be good or bad—whether we be dark or lightsome, we are always wrong. There is a general perversion of opinion against us, and, in the quaint language of former times, “no wood comes amiss to make arrows for our destruction.”⁽²⁾ We are

(2) The Bishop of Chester (in his *Letter to Mr. Butler*, 4th edition) observes: “Most sincerely do I wish that religious controversy could always have been carried on in that tone of mildness and moderation which, a few instances only excepted, pervades your answer to Dr. Southey’s *Book of the Church*.”—Shortly after he says: “You have yourself, in strong terms, deprecated the unfairness of imputing to the principles of a church, the individual obliquities of a few of its members;” and yet the very next moment, forgetting, in the ardour of his zeal, his own regulations for polemic warfare, he buckles on his armour, seizes the *firebrand* with one hand and the *poisoned arrow* with the other, and with slander on his tongue, rushes headlong—not against his antagonist in single combat—but into the midst of the whole camp of the enemy. “It affords,” cries the bishop, “a most *clear* and *inaubitable* evidence, that there is something in the spirit of the Roman Catholic religion which neither time nor experience can alter;” — and with the charitable intention of slandering, he only pronounces an honour-

deemed both foolish and criminal for adhering to our religion in opposition to more modern and

able eulogium!—But increasing in rage as he advances in the conflict, he exclaims, “which contains the germ of intolerance and persecution:”—if the aggressor were here met with “the cruel arms of retaliation,” he would be instantly beaten from the field.—Let him, however, proceed in his attack: “Which poisons the fountain of truth!!!” Whatever truth there be in Protestantism, whence does it come? The Catholic Church most assuredly had the keeping of the fountain of truth for 1500 years before Protestantism was heard of; and supposing the poison to have been thrown in only a thousand years before, the stream must have been so woefully impregnated, that it is no presumption to surmise that the God of purity and holiness would have employed more able and less dishonest workmen in it’s purification than a Luther or a Cranmer, a Henry or an Elizabeth; who were sure more thoroughly to pollute and embitter, instead of restoring, its sweetness and transparency. Like unhandy workmen on a masterpiece of art, they only deformed where they pretended to embellish; like unskilful alchemists, they only tainted what they undertook to purify. They encountered the certain punishment of presumption; and what in their vanity, their folly, and their impiety, they chose to designate as blemished and contaminated, was only proved to the world to be more beautiful in it’s form, and more excellent in it’s quality. That all-consummate work which the hand of God himself had fashioned, was not to be improved by the presumptuous labours of created man.

more convenient opinions; no credit is given to us for our motives; and we are accused of a dere-

But, *supposing* the fountain to have been poisoned, can the Bishop of Chester tell us who or what effected the miracle of its purification! If it were not the wonder-working sceptre of an immaculate Henry?—was it the fury and impiety of Luther? If it were not the supremacy of Henry, was it the repeated doctrinal amendments of the child Edward? If it were not the amendments of Edward—was it the worldly-wise and more deliberate improvements of Elizabeth? If it were not the forty-two, why should it be the *thirty-nine* articles? Is there such magic in numbers? Is there such virtue in fitful and evanescent doctrine?—But, the spleen of the Bishop not being yet exhausted, he thus completes the climax of his slander: “which obscures and blunts the most sagacious intellect, and represses the natural movements of a just and ingenuous mind!!!” We benighted Catholics being all too blunted to be capable of any reply to this specimen of Protestant acumen, the Bishop surely will not object to our taking an auxiliary into pay, from his own ranks, to fight this intellectual battle for us; to do so, would be to oppose the natural movements of a just and ingenuous mind. “But I must here confine myself (says our auxiliary) to this charge against the Catholic religion, of being unfavourable to *genius, talent*, and in short to *the powers of the mind*. Those who put forward this piece of rare impudence, do not favour us with *reasons* for believing that the Catholic religion has any such tendency. They content themselves with the bare assertion, not supposing that it admits of any thing like *disproof*. They look upon it as

liction of our duty in seceding from the service of our country, because we will not conform to Pro-

assertion against assertion; and, in a question which depends on mere *hardness of mouth*, they know that their triumph is secure. But this is a question that does admit of *proof*, and a very good proof too. The "Reformation," in England, was pretty nearly completed by the year 1600. By that time, all the "monkish ignorance and superstition" were swept away. The monasteries were all pretty nearly knocked down; young Saint Edward's people had robbed all the altars; and the 'virgin' queen had put the finishing hand to the pillage. So that all was, in 1600, become as *Protestant* as heart could wish. Very well: the *kingdom of France* remained buried in "monkish ignorance and superstition" until the year 1787: that is to say, 187 years after *happy* England had stood in a blaze of Protestant light! Now then, if we carefully examine into the number of men remarkable for great powers of mind, men famed for their knowledge or genius; if we carefully examine into the number of such men produced *by France* in these 187 years, and the number of such men produced *by England, Scotland, and Ireland*, during the same period; if we do this, we shall get at a pretty good foundation for judging of the effects of the two religions with regard to their influence on knowledge, genius, and what is generally called learning.

"But how are we to ascertain these numbers? Very well. I shall refer to a work which has a place in every good library in the kingdom; I mean, the "UNIVERSAL HISTORICAL, CRITICAL, AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY." This work, which is every where received as

testantism. Though the presumption is both uncharitable and unjust, yet too many imagine that

authority as to *facts*, contains lists of persons of all nations *celebrated for their published works*. But, then, to have a place in these lists, the person must have been *really distinguished*; his or her works must have been considered as worthy of universal notice. From these lists I shall take my numbers, as before proposed. It will not be necessary to go into *all* the arts and sciences: eight or nine will be sufficient. It may be as well, perhaps, to take the ITALIANS as well as the French; for we all know that they were living in most shocking “monkish ignorance and superstition;” and that they, poor, unfortunate and *unplundered* souls, are so living unto this very day!

“Here, then, is the statement; and you have only to observe, that the figures represent the number of persons who were famous for the art or science opposite the name of which the figures are placed. The period is, from the year 1600 to 1787, during which period France was under what young GEORGE ROSE calls the “*dark despotism of the Catholic Church*,” and what BLACKSTONE calls “*monkish ignorance and superstition*,” and, during the same period, these Islands were in a *blaze of light*, sent forth by LUTHER, CRANMER, KNOX, and their followers. Here, then, is the statement:—

	England, Scotland, and Ireland.		France.		Italy.
Writers on Law	6	51	9
Mathematicians	17	52	15
Physicians and Surgeons	13	72	21
Writers on Natural History ...	6	33	11
Historians	21	139	22
Dramatic Writers	19	66	6

we remain firm to the ancient faith, merely through a blind attachment to the prejudices of education

	England, Scotland, and Ireland.	France.	Italy.
Grammarians	7	42	2
Poets	38	157	34
Painters	5	64	44
	<hr/> 132	<hr/> 676	<hr/> 164

“ Here is that very “ SCALE,” which a modest Scotch writer spoke of the other day, when he told the public, that, “ Throughout Europe Protestants rank *higher* in the *scale of intellect* than Catholics, and that Catholics in the *neighbourhood of Protestants are more intellectual* than those at a distance from them.” This is a fine specimen of upstart Protestant impudence. The above “ *scale*” is, however, a complete answer to it. Allow one third more to the French on account of their superior populousness, and then there will remain to them 451 to our 132 ! So that they had, man for man, *three and a half times* as much intellect as we, though they were buried all the while in “ monkish ignorance and superstition,” and though they had no Protestant *neighbours* to catch the intellect from ! Even the *Italians* surpass us in this rivalry for *intellect* ; for, their population is not equal to that of which we boast, and their number of men of mind considerably exceeds that of ours. But, do I not, all this while, misunderstand this matter ? And, by *intellect*, does not the Scotchman mean the capacity to make, not books and pictures, but *checks, bills, bonds, exchequer-bills, inimitable notes*, and the like ? Does he not mean loan-jobbing and stock-jobbing, insurance-bookings, annuities at ten per cent., kite-flying, and all the “ *intellectual*”

and parentage; that we are content to sacrifice our country's good to an obstinate perversity of

proceedings of 'Change Alley? Ah! in that case, I confess that he is right. On *this scale* Protestants do rank *high indeed!*" *History of the Protestant Reformation*, p. 17.

As to the charge of the Catholic religion being opposed to "the natural movements of a just and ingenuous mind," I will only reply through another and a very eminent *auxiliary*, that "Catholicity has been the belief of the most illustrious characters that ever did honour to the name of man," and leave the bishop to seek the solution of his problem where and how he may. I refer not to the long catalogue of saints, of martyrs, and of apostles; to men who at the risk of their lives, and with the sacrifice of every temporal comfort, have carried the light of the gospel to all the nations of the known world:—I refer not to a Moore, a Fisher, a Borromeo, a Turenne, a Fenelon:—I refer not to those hundreds of individuals, who in every Catholic province of the universe, devote every faculty with which God has blessed them, to the sublime occupation of doing deeds of charity to mankind:—I refer not to *them*; for *I* am too blunted to see, and the Bishop is too *enlightened* to believe, that all these were, or are *Roman Catholics*.

With the bishop's permission, however, I will say one word more in my own person. This is not the place, neither is it my province to follow the right reverend prelate into the arena of polemic history. Mr. Butler's reply being entirely out of print, I have been unable to procure a copy of it, and therefore know not whether that gentleman

mind, and are only resolute in maintaining ourselves to be right, because it might appear degrad-

has triumphantly refuted the bishop's historical assertions, as I am sure he is so capable of doing ; but which it was not necessary that he should do, as they have long since been ably confuted by others. I will, however, observe in passing, that Dr. Blomfield's annotations upon the creed of Pius IV. would shame the meanest tyro in theology ;—that his application of the decree of the Council of Constance relative to Huss, is wholly and entirely perverted ;—that he every where confounds discipline with doctrine, and doctrine with discipline ;—that he cites the opinions of councils, without waiting to discuss their validity, or without distinguishing the unratified decisions of an unauthorized few, from the authenticated decrees of an œcumenical assembly of the pastors of the church. As long as the bishop's historical facts rest only upon his *ipse dixit*, the *ipse dixit* of any other man is as good to refute them : but, *satis superque*.

My object has been to show that his Lordship can sometimes convert the sword of the spirit into a sword of steel ; and that, neither *the fire-brand* nor *the poisoned arrow* are weapons so entirely disused by ministers of the establishment, as he would wish us to suppose.*

How effectual is example ! In a charge delivered last year, in the diocese of Chester, and published at the request of the Clergy present, we find the following extract, from a bull of the present Pontiff :—“ We also, venerable

* The Bishop refers his readers to “ A comparative view of the Churches of England and Rome.” — I beg to refer them to Dr. Lingard's convincing answer to that publication.

ing to acknowledge ourselves to be wrong. But I should wish it to appear that we have other

brethren, conformably to our apostolical duty, exhort you diligently to occupy yourselves by all means to turn away your flock from these *deadly pastures*; [i. e. the Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue].” The Archdeacon of Richmond here proves himself a worthy subaltern of his diocesan commander. Nay, we are free to confess that the servant has outdone the master; if not in the boldness, at least in the impudence of his slander. What will be the astonishment of the reader, when, instead of *these deadly pastures*, referring to *the Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue*, he sees that these expressions relate to what shall be described in the Pontiff’s own words:

“What shall I say more? The iniquity of our enemies has so increased, that, besides the deluge of pernicious books, contrary to the faith, it even goes so far as to convert to the detriment of religion the Holy Scriptures, which have been given us from above for the general edification. You are not ignorant, venerable brethren, that a society, commonly called *the Bible Society*, audaciously spreads itself over the whole earth; and that in *contempt of the traditions of the holy fathers, and contrary to the decree of the Council of Trent*, it exerts all its efforts, and every means, to translate, or rather to corrupt the holy scriptures into the vulgar tongue of nations, which gives just cause to fear that the same may happen in all the other translations, as in those already known—namely, that we shall find in them a bad interpretation; instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the gospel of man, or rather the gospel of the devil. Behold, venerable brethren, whither

motives for not deserting an ancient cause, a cause in which we have endured so long and so cruel a

it tends, omitting nothing to accomplish its impious purpose; for it glories, not only in printing its translations, but even in going about to towns and distributing them among the people: sometimes it sells them, and sometimes, with perfidious liberality, gives them away.”—*Rescript* of May 3, 1824.

Such are the *deadly pastures* mentioned in the “Rescript,” and not, as the Archdeacon unblushingly asserts, *the Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue*. But, such are the extravagant and disgraceful impositions by which the people of this country are deluded,—by which Christianity itself is brought into disrepute,—and by which the rights and characters of innocent men are sacrificed.

Is there not also some reason for the vigilance and restrictions of the Bishop of Rome, as to reading the scripture in the vulgar tongue? In one of the regulations of the Council of Trent, it is declared, as a matter of discipline, “That since the *promiscuous* allowance of the bible in the vulgar tongue has been proved by experience to do more harm than good, it is determined that a discretionary power should be invested in the curate or confessor, to allow such versions to be read by those only who would suffer no detriment from the reading, but would receive an increase of faith and piety.” There has long been an authorized translation of the sacred writings in the Italian language, which till lately was open to every one; but in consequence of the eager and intrusive circulation of the corrupted translations of the Bible Societies, the restrictions of the Council of Trent, originally framed under similar circum-

martyrdom, than the shame of being branded as apostates; and that, circumstanced as we are, it

stances, were again imposed: but the regulations are not binding on the Catholics of this country, nor, indeed, do they extend beyond Italy itself. We have every where editions of the bible in every size, from the folio to the duodecimo, and have full liberty to read as we list, with proper dispositions, and a due regard to the annotations annexed for the interpretation thereof. In Ireland the circulation of the scriptures among the Roman Catholics has been very great, particularly of late years. Two editions of the New Testament are now lying before me, one dated 1821, and the other 1826; the latter is a stereotyped and a very cheap edition. It is prefaced by the following approbation of the Archbishops:—

“ We approve of this stereotyped edition of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, being according to the Douay version; and we authorize Richard Coyne, of Capel Street, Dublin, to print and publish it.

“ Given at Dublin, December 16, 1825.

PATRICK CURTIS, D.D. &c.

ROBERT LAFFAN, D.D. &c.

DANIEL MURRAY, D.D. &c.

OLIVER KELLY, D.D. &c.

So that, though the Pontiff has been pleased to style the Bibles of *the Society* deadly pastures, yet the salutary food of the word of God, *translated into the vulgar tongue*, whatever the Archdeacon may say to the contrary, is still freely permitted, with an almost nominal restriction in the Papal States, to the whole of the Christian world.

is both ungenerous and unjust to accuse us of being supine and indifferent to the public interest. In arduous times, in periods of political danger, if a man is not found at his post, he should be able to give a good excuse for his absence. It is this which I profess to undertake : I profess to prove that the fault lies with those who impose the restrictions, not with those who submit to them ; and that, by acting otherwise than as we do, we should only incur the guilt of a criminal subserviency to our temporal interests, and make a sacrifice both of our honour and our conscience. Such are the motives for the publication of the following REASONS : they are convincing to me, and I hope they may prove so to others. ^(a)

^(a) I feel another inducement to this undertaking. Charity urges us to use every reasonable expedient and exertion to do good to others ; to diffuse those blessings which we enjoy ourselves ; to impart a knowledge of the truth which we believe, and bear testimony to the faith we have received from our forefathers.

But, to those who believe not in the necessity of any fixed and *steadfast* faith—who, far from esteeming heresy, schism, and dissension in matters of religion, as *works of the flesh*, and suggestions of Satan, allow themselves to be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, heedless whither they are carried ;—to those who peruse the Scriptures, believing what chimes in with their ideas, but rejecting what displeases them, (though both the one and the other

As I have written nothing in a spirit of animosity, so I hope none will be offended with that freedom

rest equally upon the same authority, and are often to be found together, in the same page;)—to those who, in contradiction to the opinion of St. Peter, imagine that none are so little learned as not to be fit interpreters of the law, and expounders of the sacred doctrine, and that all are so wise and stable as to be proof against the enemy of truth, in his endeavours to induce us to wrest the words of God to our own *destruction and perdition*;—to those who are unwilling to submit their reason *to the obedience of faith*, but are resolved to emancipate themselves altogether from ecclesiastical authority; upon which resolution, both in theory and in practice, every religious establishment may be said to have been founded, even at the moment of its separation from the parent Church;—to those who have no faith in the promise of Christ, that the spirit of truth shall abide for ever with his religion;—to those who take religious faith to be a belief in what requires not the exercise of faith, namely, a belief in what they can comprehend with their own reason, and see with their own eyes; instead of, what St. Paul terms, *the evidence of things which are not seen*, and the remedy to that state of intellectual darkness to which *original sin* had reduced mankind, (a doctrine itself as inexplicable and incomprehensible as any that the Almighty has revealed to man, but which, if we do not believe, we are no longer Christians);—to those, in fine, who look upon religious faith as a matter of indifference, who, knowing that two contradictory propositions cannot both be true, yet fancy that each is equally pleasing to the God of truth, and equally satis-

of discussion which the nature of the subject required : none will be so unjust as to deny us the

factory as a foundation on which to build that *steadfast faith without which we must be condemned*,—who laugh at error as a play-thing with which we may amuse ourselves as long and in what manner we will, without being answerable for the consequences,—and who consider delusion in controverted points as a matter of no importance whatever:—to all such I am well aware that my REASONS considered in reference to religion, will appear vain and unmeaning.

I address myself to these only who, while they believe in the doctrines of Revelation, are willing to take them in their approved and established sense; to inquire sincerely in what manner they were received in the first ages of the Church, and what authority has been appointed to interpret them; and who, while they acknowledge the divinity of our Saviour, are also ready to believe and follow his Gospel. How can we say we believe in Christ, without believing in his *doctrines*? surely the one is incompatible with the other.

It will be seen that I have touched but slightly upon the evidence, tending to establish the truths of Catholicity. I have only done so incidentally; merely taking advantage of the opportunities afforded for that purpose, in the arguments I have undertaken to advance against some of the doctrines of Protestantism. The controverted points however, enumerated in the parliamentary oaths, naturally gave a greater scope to that portion of the subject. In undertaking the defence of Catholicity, the difficulty must always be, rather to avoid a redundancy of evidence, than

right of displaying the motives of our conduct with candour and with truth.

Much more might have been offered in exculpation; more reasons adduced, and more objections

to produce strong and convincing testimony of its truth. The descent, the parentage, and the birth of our religion; her infancy, her youth, and her age; her troubles and her misfortunes; her success and her triumphs: every period of her history, and every event of her lengthened existence: every prophecy of ancient days, and every revelation which accompanied her announcement to the world: the wickedness of a few, and the eminent sanctity of numbers of her pastors: the zeal of her friends, and the malignity of her enemies: the perfidiousness and apostacy of some of her most distinguished champions: the open revolt of thousands of her own rebellious children; the learning and the piety of her faithful followers: the countless multitudes whom she has ever embraced within her fold: *all*, in their various and respective ways, proclaim the power and the truth of Catholicity, as well as the fostering care of a superintending Providence, that cherishes and marks her as his own. It cannot, therefore, be for want of materials, that I have confined myself within such narrow limits, in treating of the Roman Catholic Religion; but, because it was not necessary for my purpose to say more.

If there should appear any inconsistency in arguing at one time, upon the ostensible articles of the Church of England, and at another time as if she had no articles at all; the inconsistency must rest with the Church that places herself in such a predicament, and thereby affords only another proof of her insufficiency.

refuted : but it is not the intention of the writer to enter into a long and elaborate discussion, (that has been often done by abler hands than his;) it is only hoped that sufficient has been brought forward to stimulate inquiry upon a most important, but most perverted or neglected question ; to remove some at least of the causes which keep alive a spirit of hostility towards us ; to do justice to our motives, and to promote unity, peace, and harmony among Christians. Let us indulge the hope, that *the night is past, and that the day is at hand* ; and that the darkness of prejudice may at length be dispelled by the force of the light of truth.

Catholics are often accused of seeking the redress of their grievances with intemperance ; but let Protestants fancy themselves in the same circumstances in which they have placed *us*, and if they are not indignant at their wrongs, their sensibilities are little to be envied. Is it imagined that the length and ferocity of the persecution we have endured, have so daunted the spirit and lowered the pride of its devoted victims, that men of high rank and ancient name, — of honourable feeling and of untainted reputation, — that the descendants of many who have deserved well of their country, — that the lineal representatives of the barons of Runymede, will hang their heads and hide their faces, when a vial of slander and defamation is

poured out upon them? Are we to afford credit to the imputation, by silence, or are we to confront our accusers and repel the slander, to the shame of those who gave it birth? It is no satisfaction to hear that we are accused as a body, and not as individuals: since, as members of the same religion, we are all so linked together, by that unity of faith which is the very essence of Catholicity, that what is true of the body, is true also of the individual. No man can be a Catholic, who does not hold each doctrine of his Church whole and entire;—no man can be a Catholic, who rejects one single tenet which the Church has proposed to his belief, as a revelation from heaven. If he does so, he separates himself from the great community of Christians, and ceases to be a Catholic. What the Church teaches as an article of faith, we must believe as such; if she holds a doctrine, we must hold that doctrine also, or we are not Catholics. It is therefore impossible to separate the community from the individual, or the individual from the community. The Church is not an immaterial being, nor a creature of the imagination, but an immense congregation of individual members, all holding one faith and one baptism; all united in one fold, under one shepherd. Neither the Pope, nor the college of cardinals, nor the court of Rome, constitutes the Church, but that immense society of

Christians, dispersed throughout the universe, yet bound together by a spiritual obedience to the same supreme but spiritual head of the Christian world.^(h) As *Christians*, the various sects by which we are surrounded and assailed, make no impression on us; but, as *men*, we are equally influenced by the freedom or despotism of civil governments—we partake, in common with others, of the evils of unjust oppression, or of the benefits of wise and liberal legislation. I wish, therefore, to be understood to make a distinction between speaking politically, as the degraded member of a free state, with the remembrance of all our wrongs and the miseries of Ireland present to my mind,—and speaking as a Christian, dispassionately discussing a mere point of religious controversy, without reference to its political consequences. In either case, I trust I have advanced nothing in a spirit unbecoming the subject, though I have said much which I am sorry to have been obliged to say. In justice I might have said much more. I will take this opportunity of stating that I am confident we are not actuated by any selfish or private views, in thus strenuously and warmly advocating our rights; but that we look mainly to the general peace and prosperity of

^(h) It must always be remembered that this spiritual head is *much more* restrained in the exercise of his spiritual sovereignty, than are the civil rulers of the freest states in the use of their temporal power.

the empire; which can never be true to herself, or great in the eyes of foreign states, till she cancels every trace of that barbarous code which has so long disgraced her statute book, and thereby drives that spirit of bigotry from the world, which has chosen England for her last and solitary haunt.

REMARKS ON THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH'S LATE CHARGE.

The charge of the Bishop of Peterborough, delivered in July of last year, and printed at the request of his Clergy, having within these few days fallen under my observation, and conceiving it to be a document of importance at this juncture, I beg leave to offer the following observations upon it.

The Bishop observes that Roman Catholics are excluded from parliament “ *not* because they believe in Transubstantiation, but because they who believe in that doctrine, believe *also* that a foreign Potentate hath or ought to have jurisdiction in the dominions of his Majesty, King George.” His Lordship, however, does not show how this *practical principle*, as he calls it, affects the allegiance of Roman Catholics to their sovereign, or the exercise of their duties as civil members of the state. He does not state it openly, and I trust he does not

mean to insinuate that, in violation of their oaths, Roman Catholics acknowledge any but a *purely* spiritual jurisdiction in the sovereign Pontiff. Hence, we have not to prove that the jurisdiction of the Pope is *only* spiritual, but that this spiritual jurisdiction is not a *practical* doctrine, hostile to the liberties of those countries in which it is exercised, and incompatible with those civil duties which, as subjects, we owe the state. Now, if the doctrine itself be not considered a sufficient guarantee—if the renunciation, by all Catholic Divines, of every iota of temporal sovereignty, either directly or indirectly, in the supreme head of the Church; and the duty of civil obedience to every form of government under which our lot may be cast, as inculcated by all Catholic moralists—be not enough to satisfy the most timid and the most prejudiced; let us examine the machinery of this *practical principle*, and see how it works, and how it has worked, ever since the deposing power, (which was a temporal and not a spiritual power,) was abandoned by the general concurrence of Christendom. The spiritual authority of the supreme head of the Church neither entitles him to appoint to a single Bishopric, nor a single Curacy—gives him no power over any portion of the temporalities of the Clergy—nor any right to interfere with the discipline or government of any national Church:—it only invests him with a

general superintendence over the Christian world, in spiritual concerns, and places him under an obligation, as far as in him lies, to see that the doctrines and morality of the Gospel are both preached and practised by his subalterns in the hierarchy. He rules not as a despot, but is compelled to regulate his conduct by the canons of the Church; he possesses no power of punishment, but that of suspension from the performance of *spiritual* functions;—no power of removal from *temporalities*, but with permission of the sovereign, or commonwealth. In point of fact, I believe it to be true, that not a single instance is upon record, in any state, whether Catholic or Protestant, in which any inconvenience has arisen from the exercise of the spiritual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. The Protestant states of Prussia, Holland, Hanover, Germany, Switzerland, &c. have all entered into a *concordat* with the Pope, for the exercise of his spiritual supremacy amongst their respective subjects. As well as Russia, they all retain accredited agents at the court of Rome; leaving England a solitary example of the infraction of the common rules of propriety and courtesy, in the intercourse between civilized nations. We send ministers to the Turk and the Idolator, to the worshippers of the sun, and perhaps to the votaries of Juggernaut, while we esteem it a crime, worthy of punishment by the laws of the land, to hold any communica-

tion whatever with the most ancient and most dignified sovereignty in Christendom!

But, to pursue our argument;—what is no treason in Prussia, Holland, or Hanover, cannot surely be treason in England. If the exercise of the spiritual supremacy of a foreign Potentate neither tarnishes the lustre of those crowns, nor impairs their authority, what is to infect it with it's blighting and destructive quality the moment it arrives within the atmosphere of the British Isles? Does the Bishop of Peterborough suppose that his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Hanover bear him a divided or qualified allegiance, because he has placed them upon an equality with their Protestant brethren, and legally permits the exercise of the spiritual supremacy of the head of their Church amongst them? Or does such a supposition exist in the minds of any one of the Protestant sovereigns of continental Europe, who have all been wise enough to act with the same good sense and liberality? Are they not rather assured thereby, of the increased affections and loyalty of their people, of the augmentation of their strength, and of the stability of their government? Are the same tried and sacred principles to be true every where else, and false only in England? why are the feelings and dispositions of men to be regulated here by the laws of contrariety? Are wisdom, justice, prudence, benignity, and mercy, to be virtues in Germany, and

follies in Great Britain? While the experiment has been found to fail every where else, is England alone expected to thrive upon the heart-burnings, jealousies, humiliations, and contentions, growing out of unjust and invidious legal distinctions between man and man? Are religious feuds and domestic strife to be the eternal, cherished, and hopeful inheritance of these realms? Is England, and *only* England, to be that cursed hot-bed of intolerance, which shoots up her rank and poisonous herbage, to the very infecting of the air we breathe?—It is absurd to attempt to explain it; and for this reason I suppose it is that the Bishop of Peterborough does *not* attempt to explain how a system of justice and liberality is to weaken the allegiance and alienate the affections of the people—how this *practical* doctrine of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope is thus to run riot amongst Englishmen, while it passes soberly through the imaginations of the Dutch, the Prussians and the Hanoverians. Really it would seem to have become an axiom amongst us that, while the rest of the world were triumphantly advancing in the science of legislation, *we* were compelled, as a matter of duty, to retrograde, for the sake of preserving an example of the perverse fatuity of man: and, as if a period of almost unparalleled political embarrassment, together with the common ills of mortality, were not sufficient to torment us, that we

must needs try our strength and our patience, with the frightful evils of religious persecution. It would appear that the time was come, when the wisdom of our neighbours ought to supersede our own; that old principles and old adages, which had been the pride of our ancestors for centuries, were to be reversed; and that it was now befitting the character and reputation of an Englishman to look with envy and complacency on the civil and religious liberties of foreigners, and even of Frenchmen!—But this spiritual supremacy is, and has been, and *will* be exercised in these realms, in spite of laws, opinions, and penalties; and that, too, amongst an irritated and insulted, though a *loyal* people. Even, in the very worst of times, under the most cruel and trying persecutions,⁽ⁱ⁾ and when an assumed and presumptuous power in the spiritual head of their Church endeavoured to mislead them, the Catholics of this country, as a body, were never drawn into one single act of disloyalty to the state. On the contrary, they were ever remarkable for an inflexible and conscientious

(i) Persecution never yet consolidated the interests of any country, but has invariably had the effect of weakening, by the discord, turbulence, and even rebellion, which it has occasioned; neither did it ever yet gain a willing and sincere convert to its cause. Yet do we find both statesmen and divines who are still enamoured with it.

fidelity to the sovereign. And, in times nearer to our own, it is a singular fact that the most influential members of the rebellion in Ireland, which was any thing but a *Catholic* rebellion, were all Protestants who disowned allegiance to this spiritual authority, and not Catholics who acknowledged it. Is it not, then, better that this spiritual supremacy should be exercised in an open, regular, and legal manner, than as it is now, by stealth, and in opposition to the laws? Would the sanction of government to this practical doctrine make it more dangerous in its nature, or more hurtful in its consequences?^(k)

(k) "It cannot be necessary to enter into the history of Catholic affairs during the present reign. With the replies of the foreign universities to Mr. Pitt's queries, and the oaths taken by Catholics according to the acts passed in their favour, the reader must be acquainted. I shall, therefore, content myself with asking whether the oaths and protestations contained in the preceding pages, do not fully bear me out in the assertion that the great body of the British Catholics has never been accustomed to acknowledge in the Pope any temporal authority, or to consider the deposing and dispensing powers as parts of it's religious creed. But if this be true of Catholics in former times, it must be true of those of the present day; nor do I see how any man can rationally accuse them of partiality to the doctrines they have disclaimed, or fear that they should adopt them at any future period. The fact is, that there exists not within the United Kingdom,

The Bishop of Peterborough, having thus far contented himself with merely stating a reason

nor within any kingdom in Europe, a body of men whose religious opinions with respect to civil government are so accurately ascertained. They have not only explained their sentiments, they have sworn to the truth of their explanation. They have made their allegiance doubly secure: they are bound to it by their religion; they are also bound to it by their oath.

“In conclusion, it may be observed, that the statute-book at present is, on this subject, in contradiction with itself. Whoever peruses the preambles to the statutes, from the pressure of which the Catholics pray to be relieved, will learn that they were enacted against persons described as traitors to their country, supposed to hold that faith is not to be kept with Protestants, and to believe that the Pope could lawfully depose princes, and absolve subjects from their allegiance. By the acts passed during the present reign in favour of Catholics, it is admitted that those who take the oaths prescribed therein, do not come under this description. Of course they are not the men against whom the penal statutes were enacted; why then are they still made to suffer under them? Certainly justice and consistence require that this contradiction should no longer exist; but that all who bear true allegiance to the king—all who abjure the temporal superiority of every other prince or prelate—should be admitted to the common rights and distinctions of British subjects.”
—(Dr Lingard’s *Tracts*, pp. 290-1.)

N.B. This “Collection of Documents to ascertain the sentiments of British Catholics in former ages respecting

for our exclusion, without any attempt to prove its justice, proceeds to absolve the opposers of eman-

the power of the popes," and Dr. Lingard's excellent Observations thereon, ought to be the study of every legislator.

"But it is said, and from high authority too, that to a king who is not a Roman Catholic, they cannot bear other than a divided allegiance. I say the charge is unsupported by fact, and, if it were true, would not be a very discreet charge to make against more than seven millions of people, now living within the allegiance of the king of this empire. I say, further, that it is disproved wherever Roman Catholics are admitted (and that is every where but here,) to a full enjoyment of civil rights under sovereigns not of their creed. I say that it is disproved in Prussia, disproved in Denmark, disproved in Sweden, disproved in Hanover, disproved in the Netherlands, disproved throughout the Russian Empire, and proved nowhere.

It is a charge not imputed by the laws of England, nor by the oaths which exclude the Catholics: for those oaths impute only spiritual errors. But it is imputed, which is more to the purpose, by those persons who approve of the excluding oaths, and wish them retained. But, to the whole of this imputation; even if no other instance could be adduced; as far as a strong and remarkable example can prove the negative of an assumption which there is not a single example to support,—the full, and sufficient, and incontestible answer is Canada. Canada, which, until you can destroy the memory of all that now remains to you of your sovereignty on the North

cipation from the charge of bigotry and intolerance, which is brought against them, by asserting that

American continent, is an answer practical, memorable, difficult to be accounted for, but blazing as the sun itself in sight of the whole world, to the whole charge of divided allegiance. At your conquest of Canada, you found it Roman Catholic; you had to choose for her a constitution in Church and State. You were wise enough not to thwart public opinion. Your own conduct towards Presbyterianism in Scotland was an example for imitation; your own conduct towards Catholicism in Ireland was a beacon for avoidance; and in Canada you established and endowed the religion of the people. Canada was your only Roman Catholic colony. Your other colonies revolted; they called on a Catholic power to support them, and they achieved their independence. Catholic Canada, with what Lord Liverpool would call her half-allegiance, *alone* stood by you. She fought by your side against the interference of Catholic France. To reward and encourage her loyalty, you endowed in Canada bishops to say mass, and to ordain others to say mass, whom, at that very time, your laws would have hanged for saying mass in England; and Canada is still yours in spite of Catholic France—in spite of her spiritual obedience to the Pope—in spite of Lord Liverpool's argument—and in spite of the independence of all the states that surround her. This is the only trial you have made. Where you allow to the Roman Catholics their religion undisturbed, it has proved itself to be compatible with the most faithful allegiance. It is only where you have placed allegiance and religion before them as a dilemma,

as we have now complete religious toleration,^(h) the question at issue regards not *religious liberty*, but *political power*; at the same time observing that a “claim to civil power must be founded on civil relations.” Now, it is precisely upon this ground that we rest our claim. We swear civil allegiance to the sovereign, not by force, but freely and willingly, and as a matter of conscience; we pay taxes, even in a greater proportion than others; we contribute to poor-rates, tithes, and Church-rates; we serve the army and the navy; we perform every civil duty demanded of us, and even ask leave to perform more. If this does not place us in a situation of *civil relationship* with the state, what can? It is not *our* fault that we do not serve our country as senators, &c., or hold offices of trust or power; if therefore we be deficient, it is bigotry and intolerance which make us so. But if it was no crime in St. Paul or in our Saviour to dissent from the religion

that they have preferred (as who will say they ought not?) their religion to their allegiance. How then stands the imputation? Disproved by history, disproved in all states where both religions co-exist, and in both hemispheres, and asserted in an exposition by Lord Liverpool, solemnly and repeatedly abjured by all Catholics, as of the discipline of *their church*.”—Lord Nugent’s *Statement*.

^(h) It is only mockery to talk of *tolerating* a religion, as long as penalties and disabilities are made the necessary appendages to its profession.

of the state, because they knew it to be false, it is no crime in us : and as long as the religion of the state requires us to forswear ourselves, before we can serve that state as senators, or in offices of trust and power, I am confident we are not wanting in our civil duty for refusing to do so. We do not ask for political rights as *Roman Catholics*, but we ask for them as good subjects of the king, as useful members of the state, and as fulfilling all the duties of *civil relationship* towards the government and the institutions of the country, of which the Protestant church establishment is one. Neither do we ask, as the Bishop of Peterborough would imply, for *offices of trust and power*: these, the sovereign must always bestow or withhold at his pleasure. We ask only for those rights which belong to us in virtue of the constitution of our country,—for *eligibility* to office,—for those privileges which belong to our respective states,—for that liberty to serve our fellow-subjects which all others of our own class in the commonwealth possess:—in fine, for that, and that *alone*, which we should enjoy, were we *not* Roman Catholics. Is it not, then, bigotry and intolerance to deprive us of our birth-right, not because we are bad subjects, but because we conscientiously differ from the religion of the state? It is much rather the opposers of emancipation that are deficient in their civil relationship to the government, by disfran-

chising many whom the constitution invests with senatorial rights,—by circumscribing the prerogative of the crown in the choice of its officers, and by defrauding the state of her intrinsic right to avail herself of the worth and talent of every individual member of her community. While the accusation, therefore, will not stand, as far as it regards *us*, it applies with double force against our political opponents.

If, however, there be not bigotry in this, there is, at least, selfishness and injustice in the next position in which the Bishop places himself as the enemy of the civil rights of Catholics. “And if the clergy,” says he, “in particular, have reason to apprehend that additional power conferred on the Roman Catholics, would endanger their own Church, they are surely entitled, without being branded as bigots, to petition the legislature against measures injurious to themselves.” This is a candid, manly avowal, which does equal credit to the Bishop with the general temperance and propriety of his language, and which forms so pleasing a contrast with the rhapsody and abuse which too often has been, and still is, poured out upon us by the dignitaries of the Established Church. I have long thought that the fancied danger to their own Church, and the risk of seeing “themselves and their families reduced to beggary,” had, at least, an equal share in the very active

opposition we met with from the prelates and ministers of the establishment, with the desire which they must necessarily have, as members of the "True Church, to support it for its own sake." Now, if the property of the Church were only proportioned to its necessities, or if its surplus revenues were voluntarily applied, as formerly, to the erection and endowment of hospitals and colleges, and the establishment of other useful institutions, we could not fairly prefer an accusation of selfishness from the avowal of such a motive: we could only say it was unjust. For it is undoubtedly unjust to sanctify the means by the end, when those means are a direct penalty upon one half of the population of the empire, and a visible deterioration of the well-being and prosperity of the whole state. Even supposing the premises to be true, that emancipation would endanger the temporalities of the establishment, it must surely be unjust to defend them by such means as these; but when, even in the opinion of their present possessors it is only problematical, it amounts to tyranny and injustice of the very first order, to punish men for crimes, not only before they have committed them, but of which it is not known that they will ever be guilty. They might as well arrest every poor man in the kingdom, and throw him into prison, lest he should be tempted to rob his richer neighbour upon the first opportunity.

But I trust to shew that, far from there being any reasonable ground of danger to the establishment from reinstating the Catholics in their civil rights, it would equally be our interest and our inclination to uphold the honours and temporalities of the Church of England.

In the first place, we most solemnly disclaim even the most remote idea of ever being repossessed of the temporalities of the church in these realms; and in proof of the sincerity of this disclaimer, we state both the utter impossibility of the thing, and the probable inexpediency of it, even were it possible. It is impossible, from the present state both of religious and political parties in the country. Supposing emancipation to introduce eight Catholics into the House of Peers, and ten or twenty into the Commons; what is this against hundreds? Catholicity must indeed work by enchantment, to gain the ascendancy over such an opposing mass; at least it would be a novelty in the history of mankind. It is equally improbable that we should unite with the dissenters for the purpose of *despoiling the establishment*, and dispossessing "a party which will then [when the cause of religious liberty shall be achieved] have lost its ascendancy, and have become a sect among sects." The Bishop of Peterborough cannot surely be serious in asserting that as long as the establishment retains her temporalities, with the influ-

ence necessarily attached to them, together with the Universities, and her paramount political privileges, that she can ever fall from that immense ascendancy which she now enjoys over every other religion in the state. The only ascendancy she would lose, is a hateful lording it over all who presume to differ from her—an ascendancy which teaches her to insult and oppress those whom, in her fears, she fancies to be her enemies,—an ascendancy that marks her for the scorn and pity of her victims. I am sure that every true friend of the establishment will acknowledge, that the sooner she falls from such an ascendancy as this, the better. But what object can Catholics have in uniting with the dissenters to *despoil* the establishment? We most cordially unite with them in our common endeavours to obtain the most perfect religious freedom; and we rely upon those common endeavours for success. The Church of England, “if more numerous than any *single* sect, is less so than the others united:”^(d) and does she expect still successfully to oppose the energies of such antagonists, bound together by a similarity of grievances, with justice to embolden them in their career, and with so noble and glorious an object in view? The thing is impossible. “The removal of civil disabilities can alone remove all cause of

(d) Vide *Chargé*.

contention—can alone restore harmony between the Church of England and other religious parties.” And all cause of contention being removed, the union which was cemented by their common grievances, is at once dissolved. When the passions are calmed, and the interests of every class are amalgamated by equal laws and equal rights, the present lamentable discord will cease, religious harmony will be restored throughout the land, and Christians of every denomination will be linked together by the bonds of charity and good will alone. In every country in Europe, in which Catholics and Protestants have been confounded in a community of interests by an equality of rights, such has been the happy result. The Church of England might then enjoy her revenues and her privileges in peace and comfort, without the hatred or envy of her neighbours; exchanging the fierceness of the vulture for the meekness of the dove; being no longer a domineering mistress, nor an insulting tyrant.—The only point of union between Catholics and dissenters, is the great cause of religious liberty. That being accomplished, no further alliance can either be required or expected. The dissenters have invariably departed infinitely further from the parent Church, than the members of the Establishment. What, therefore, should we gain by uniting with them to despoil that Establishment? They, united, being infinitely the stronger party,

would, in case of success, take every thing for themselves. I speak not of Ireland: any spoliation of the Established Church *there*, must proceed either from a convulsion in the country, or from the power of the Protestant landholders. There are no sectaries of sufficient force and numbers in that portion of the empire; and, as I said before, ten Catholic representatives must be more than destroying angels, to accomplish such a work. The redress of the most grievous clerical exactions, and a moderate competency from the Government to the Catholic clergy, operating with the late amendments in the tithing system, and equal laws, and equal rights, would so far satisfy the people, as to remove every idea from their minds of despoiling the establishment. To shew the probable inexpediency of Catholics repossessing themselves of the Church property, even if they had the power to do so, we have only to look to the history of Europe to satisfy ourselves that every church which has yet fallen, has fallen under the weight of its own riches. Those riches first produced a laxity of morals among the clergy, before they became the envy, or excited the cupidity, of the laity. Suffice it to say, that they effected the downfall of the church which possessed them. As zealous members of our religion, we ought not, therefore, to desire to see her again exposed to similar hazards and temptations; and I am sure

there is not a Catholic in the country who would not infinitely sooner see his religion with a decent competency, (such as we could give her ourselves, if the laws permitted it,) but free and independent, than again breathing the air of courts and palaces, and luxuriating in all her former riches. The Catholic Church of Ireland, with all her poverty, is probably a purer and a better Church (I mean as to morals and sanctity, for her faith has been always the same,) than she ever was in the days of her prosperity. For herself she desires nothing more than she enjoys at present, save the cessation of calumny and persecution against her children: she has all the authority she could desire over her people, because she rules them with a paternal solicitude, and receives their affectionate attachment in return: she sees and knows that riches are not requisite for the establishment of the kingdom of God—that rather covetousness is the root of all evils,—and seeing this, she cherishes her poverty as her best and surest support.

But the great security of the protestant establishment would consist in the alliance which it should be her inclination to form with her Catholic brethren. Though we differ from her on points of faith; those points are not many, and have, all of them, at one time or other, been warmly defended by some of her ablest Divines. Her ministers have frequently acknowledged that

the Catholic religion contains nothing contrary to salvation—nothing that should prevent her from being considered as a true Christian Church; and such has been more solemnly and frequently avowed by Protestant Divines upon the continent. Her discipline is nearly, her constitution is precisely, the same as ours. In our Liturgies, in the administration of the sacraments, we approximate. But the great uniting link between us, is her code of morality. The insufficiency of man; the atonement for sin; the divinity of Christ; the necessity of good works for our acceptance before God; and of repentance to obtain forgiveness of our sins; the application of the merits of Christ for our sanctification by means of the sacraments; the Decalogue of the old law, and the moral precepts of the new, are all points in which Catholics and Protestants are thoroughly united. Is it not, therefore, natural, that we should support the establishment, should we see it invaded by Calvinists and Levellers. Catholics, most assuredly, have nothing to anticipate from the downfall of the Church. As long, however, as she is unjust and intolerant, we shall oppose her; but the moment that the support of her cause becomes sanctified by moderation and justice, she may rest assured of our assistance.⁽ⁿ⁾ An Established

⁽ⁿ⁾ “ At the same time, sir, I must protest against it's

Church has ever formed a part of the constitution of the country; she is the promoter of learning, the preserver of the splendid memorials of the piety of our ancestors; she is now become the encourager of the arts; she “discharges many important duties besides those of her immediate vocation, and supplies what would otherwise be a chasm in the administration of public justice.”

being imputed to me that I am hostile to the establishment in this country. You would wrong me by such an imputation; I have no unfriendly feeling towards it when it does not exceed it's constitutional limits; but as an Englishman, viewing with conscious exultation the proud pre-eminence of my country, founded on her free institutions; I execrate, with unfeigned reprobation, every attempt to trench upon the civil and political rights of the meanest individual in the community, be his oppressors who they may. And if a church establishment, of any form of worship, in any country, requires the sacrifice of the recognized rights of the subject, to uphold its power, in my opinion it cannot fall too soon. A Church distinguishing itself by the apostolical virtues of its leaders; by its abstractedness from earthly pursuits, and preaching peace and Christian concord, serves well the cause of good government, and might, not only with safety, but with great benefit, be closely allied to it. But establishments, like most other things, must stand each on its own merits; they may be blessings, or they may be curses.” (*Letter of Edward Blount, Esq. to a Protestant Gentleman*; published in the *Catholic Miscellany*, for February, 1828.

The property of the Church in the hands of laymen, or in possession of the sectaries, neither would nor could be half so advantageous to the country as it is now. I have already said why we have no wish to see it in our own. The sacrifice of the Church Establishment is, therefore, a sacrifice which we neither desire as Christians, nor as members of the State.^(h) While in all this I deliver only the sentiments of an individual, at

(h) There is certainly some difference in the relative connection between the Church and the State, in Catholic and in Protestant England. In Catholic times, the Church was invariably the opposer of the encroachments of the crown, and, in many cases, the able and effectual supporter of the liberties of the people; whereas, the system of translating from one Bishopric to another, (a system which exists in no other Christian state) and which has been subsequently introduced, has entirely altered the character of the Episcopacy; by destroying its independance, and by depriving it of the power of throwing its weight where it might be serviceable to the interests of the country. But this is an abuse, which, great as it is, the crown has always the power to remedy. It is the Minister and not the Church, who is the greater delinquent; and we must hope to see the day when England shall possess a premier, virtuous enough to overturn this system, which marks her prelacy as a dependant class, and which certainly is not calculated, either to promote dignity in the hierarchy, or respect towards it in the people.

the same time I believe that I speak those of the body to which I belong; at any rate I am sure that what I have said, I have said in the sincerity of my heart.

I have one word to offer upon a circumstance which is frequently advanced as a mark of the liberality of the times, and as a proof that the Question of Catholic Emancipation is now permitted to stand upon its own merits, and to be decided by the unbiassed judgment of the public. I mean the neutrality of the Cabinet; which has long been a mere delusion, sounding plausible in theory, but being absolutely contradicted in practice; since THE WHOLE of the Church patronage has ever been showered down *solely* upon the professors of ascendancy principles. For it cannot be supposed that it has all fallen by accident on those only, who see imminent danger to the establishment in equalizing the distribution of civil rights throughout the country, and of satisfying all classes of the people, that they have no longer any thing to fear from ecclesiastical tyranny. We know—and for the honour of the establishment be it said—that individuals do exist in this kingdom in sufficient numbers, of irreproachable conduct, and of competent learning to fit them for the most elevated

order of the hierarchy, and yet believing that emancipation from civil thralldom would neither make Catholics nor dissenters more dangerous to the revenues of the Established Church; nay, who think that a generosity of conduct on her part, would altogether overcome the hostility of both. Is it therefore probable, that, while the existence of such men is known to all others, the first Lord of the Treasury alone should never be able to discover them? But, till he does accidentally light upon them, or rather, till every vacant see be filled with a liberal candidate until the episcopal bench be equally divided in opinion upon the question of emancipation, there can be no virtual neutrality in the Cabinet. It is mere mockery to talk of the hopes of emancipation from the neutral qualities of the ministry, while we see every particle of Church patronage thrown with force into the scale against us, and while bigotry is still the chief climbing ladder to preferment; for it is now self-evident, that the Bishops, and the Bishops alone, are the bar to our success. We are confident it will soon appear that we have the House of Commons with us; we have a decided majority amongst the Irish members; we should even triumph in the Lords, if the bishops would but give us their *six-and-twenty* votes. We only ask them to repay in kind what twenty-six Catholic peers

so freely gave *them*, in 1661. They have enjoyed the fruits of this liberality for upwards of 150 years, without making any acknowledgment in return; and the repayment now, instead of costing them any thing, would be a gain to *them*, as well as to us. It would assure them a firm and lasting support, founded on the solid basis of reciprocal generosity. As it is, they provoke us to hostility, not only by a violent and ungenerous opposition as spiritual peers, but as spiritual pastors, by deserting their duty to their own people, to attend to us, who belong not to them;—they abandon their flocks to the wolf, while they go in pursuit of an imaginary foe; they put on the helmet instead of the mitre—seize the lance in lieu of the crozier—and the pulpit, which ought to breathe peace and charity, resounds with the angry notes of war and slander.

Would it not much better accord with the vocations of their ministry, to strive more earnestly against that torrent of crime and immorality which is gaining so rapidly upon the country, than to waste their energies, as they do now, in a mad crusade against Catholics? It is a notorious fact, that the hostility of that portion of the people who are opposed to us, is to be ascribed almost entirely to the influence of the clergy; the apathy of those who are indifferent, proceeds from ignorance of Irish and of Catholic affairs; while we have good reason

to hope that the great body of educated men are favourably inclined to emancipation, from policy as well as principle: and it is much more to the extension of this feeling that we must ultimately look for success, than to any pretended neutrality of the cabinet.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON THE ADVOCATE OF EMANCIPATION.

After many anxious vicissitudes of hope and fear, after passing through a trying variety of temperature—the political horizon appeared to have settled, in almost unclouded sunshine upon the Catholics of the empire; when, to our dismay and horror, it is now again suddenly darkening around us. We cannot but fear that the appointment of the Duke of Wellington as premier, is a fatal omen to our cause: for hitherto he has but too often ranked amongst the most signal of our opposers. If the Duke of Wellington be the bigot which many imagine, our fate is sealed as long as his counsels prevail. But we are willing to hope against hope; to anticipate the strength of argument, and the influence of wisdom and expediency; and to expect that the new circumstances in which the destinies of the empire are again placed in his hands, will

elevate his mind to the level of those beneficent and liberal ideas, by which the affairs of a great nation ought alone to be guided.

When the Duke of Wellington looks back to the brilliant scenes of his eventful life, he will see that the time was, when he thought it no dishonour to hold command under Catholic sovereigns,—to receive the rewards of his services from *them*, and even to place himself, on very many occasions, under singular obligations to those whom he has since declared to be unworthy of their hire. Were it not for his Catholic soldiers, the Duke of Wellington had never gathered one solitary laurel—for all the laurels which he wears have sprung from their valour, and have been watered by their blood; but for the confidence reposed in him by Catholic governments, he had never been carried forward in his career;—but for the honours heaped upon him by Catholic monarchs, his breast had never blazed with half that brilliancy which beams upon it now; and many of those high-sounding titles which so loudly proclaim his glory to the world, would have been mute.

If justice, gratitude, and wisdom still dwell upon the earth, we trust that the day will soon arrive when the Duke of Wellington, from the elevated station which he now holds, a station far more enviable than that of the commander of the proudest army in Europe, will stand forth to remove that

blemish from his political life, of having hitherto left unrequited the services which his Catholic troops have so eminently rendered him. And I think we are justified in this expectation, by the noble sentiments which his Grace, not many months ago, expressed in parliament upon the subject. The Duke of Wellington still holds the situation under the crown^(d) which he is reported to have said to be "so consonant to his feelings, liking it, as he did, from the opportunities which it gave him to improve the condition of his old comrades in arms....which enabled him to recommend to the notice of his majesty *all* his former friends and companions, and to reward them, according to their merits, for the exertions which they had formerly made, under his command, in the field."^(e)

(d) This was written when the Duke of Wellington was both commander-in-chief and first lord of the treasury.

(e) The following public testimony which history has transmitted to us, of the Duke of Wellington's opinions on the propriety and justice of "cementing a general union of sentiment among all classes and descriptions of his Majesty's subjects, in support of the established Constitution," ought certainly to inspire us with the confident expectation, that the same *wisdom and liberality*, which distinguished his views of Irish Politics, thirty-five years ago, will likewise constitute the characteristics of his grace's administration of similar affairs *now*.

On the 16th of January, 1793, the House of Commons

Now, all that we ask is, that the Duke, as a just, a grateful, and an honourable man, will redeem this pledge.—How would it not brighten all his fame,

being met, a message was brought from his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, which contains the following passage:—"I have it in particular command from his Majesty, to recommend it to you, to apply yourselves to the consideration of such measures as may be most likely to strengthen and cement a general union of sentiment among all classes and descriptions of his Majesty's subjects, in support of the established constitution; with this view, his Majesty trusts, that the situation of his Majesty's Catholic subjects will engage your serious attention, and in the consideration of this subject, he relies on the wisdom and liberality of his Parliament." After this message had been read, an address, which was an echo of the sentiments contained in the recommendation from the throne, was agreed to. The speech of the Hon. Gentleman who seconded the address, [now Duke of Wellington,] is in page five of the 13th volume of the Irish Parliamentary debates, and is thus reported:—"In regard to what has been recommended in the speech from the throne, respecting our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, he could not repress his approbation on that head: he had no doubt of the loyalty of the Catholics of this country, and he trusted that when the question should be brought forward, respecting that description of men, that they would lay aside all animosities, and act with moderation and dignity, and not with the fury and violence of partisans." (*See Mr. Shiel's speech, at the late aggregate meeting of the Catholics of Ireland.*)

and crown all his honours, thus to address the House, (upon the first occasion of a debate on the question of Catholic emancipation) as the champion of that ill-fated land, for whose welfare, equally with that of every other portion of the empire, his sovereign has now placed the reins of state in his hands: a land which, while it gave *him* birth, has also the merit of having been the fostering parent of those companions in arms of whose services he speaks so feelingly, and for whose reward he is so impatient.

My Lords; in presenting myself to your lordships, as the advocate of the measure now proposed to your consideration; I am only indulging in the pleasing task of discharging a debt of gratitude, which has long weighed heavy upon me; for, independently of the indisputable policy of uniting all classes of his Majesty's subjects, in a common participation of the blessings of the constitution, and for other reasons, which I leave to be argued by other noble lords; I owe too much as an individual to the Catholics of this empire, and to those of several foreign states, not to avail myself with eagerness, of every opportunity of advocating these claims, as a measure of justice to the one, and as a grateful return of enlightened liberality towards the other. It is already well known to your lordships, that amongst the troops which our Gracious So-

vereign did me the honour to entrust to my command, at various periods during the war; a war undertaken expressly for the purpose of securing the happy institutions and independance of the country; that at least one half were Roman Catholics. My lords, when I call your recollection to this fact, I am sure all further eulogy is unnecessary. Your lordships are well aware for what length of period, and under what difficult circumstances, they maintained the empire buoyant upon the flood which overwhelmed the thrones, and wrecked the institutions of every other people: how they kept alive the only spark of freedom which was left unextinguished in Europe; and how, by unprecedented efforts, they at length placed us, not only far above danger, but at an elevation of prosperity for which we had hardly dared to hope. These, my lords, are sacred and imperative titles to a nation's gratitude. My lords, it is become quite needless for me to assure you that I have invariably found my Roman Catholic soldiers as patient under privations, as eager for the combat, and as brave and determined in the field, as any other portion of his majesty's troops; and in point of loyalty and devotion to their king and country, I am quite certain they have never been surpassed. I claim no merit in admitting that others might have guided the storm of battle as skilfully as myself. We have only to recur to the annals of our

military achievements to be convinced, that few indeed of our commanders have not known how to direct the unconquerable spirit of their troops, and to shed fresh glories round the British name. But, my lords, while we are free to acknowledge this, we must also confess, that without Catholic blood and Catholic valour, no victory could ever have been obtained ; and the first military talents in Europe might have been exerted in vain, at the head of half an army. My lords, if on the eve of any of those hard-fought days on which I have had the honour to command them, I had thus addressed my Roman Catholic troops : “ You well know that your country either so suspects your loyalty, or so dislikes your religion, that she has not yet thought proper to admit you amongst the ranks of her free citizens ; if, on that account, you deem it an act of injustice on her part to require you to shed your blood in her defence, you are at liberty to withdraw :” I am quite sure, my lords, that however bitter the recollections which it awakened, they would have spurned the alternative with indignation ; for the hour of danger and of glory, is the hour in which the gallant, the generous-hearted Irishman, best knows his duty, and is most determined to perform it. But if, my lords, it had been otherwise ; if they had chosen to desert the cause in which they were embarked ; though the remainder of the troops would undoubtedly have maintained

the honour of the British arms ; yet, as I have just said, no efforts of their's could ever have crowned us with victory. Yes, my lords, it is mainly to the Irish Catholic that we all owe our proud pre-eminence in our military career ; and that I, personally, am indebted for the laurels with which you have been pleased to decorate my brow—for the honours which you have so bountifully lavished on me—and for the fair fame (I prize it above all other rewards) which my country, in its generous kindness, has bestowed upon me. I cannot but feel, my lords, that you yourselves have been chiefly instrumental in placing this heavy debt of gratitude upon me, greater, perhaps, than has ever fallen to the lot of any individual; and however flattering the circumstance, it often places me in a very painful situation. Whenever I meet (and it is almost an every-day occurrence,) with any of those brave men who, in common with others, are the object of this bill, and who have so often borne me on the tide of victory; when I see them still branded with the imputation of a divided allegiance, and still declared unfit to enter within the pale of the constitution, I feel almost ashamed of the honours which have been lavished upon *me*: I feel that though the merit was their's, what was so freely given to *me*, was unjustly denied to them; that *I* had reaped, though they had sown; that they had borne the heat and burden of the day, but that the

wages and repose were *mine* alone. My lords, it is indeed to me a subject of deep regret, that of the many brave officers of the Roman Catholic persuasion, some of whom I have had occasion to bring to the notice of the country, in relating the honourable services they have performed, not one has risen to any eminence in his profession. It is not to be supposed, that either talent or merit is the exclusive privilege of Protestantism: attached as I am to the Reformed Church, I cannot give her that monopoly. No man, my lords, has had more experience to the contrary than myself. Entrusted with the command of two Catholic armies, I soon found that, with similar advantages, they were quite equal to our own. The same hatred of tyranny, the same love of liberty, the same unconquerable spirit, pervaded both the soldier and the peasant of those two Catholic states. I even found amongst them Irishmen, whom the intolerance of our laws had driven to shed the lustre of their talents over a foreign clime.

It now becomes me, my lords, to speak of the liberality which I experienced from their hands. Notwithstanding that I dissented from the religion of the state, it was never made a preliminary that I should abjure my own creed, and conform to another; (and why should I demand this sacrifice from those who are now only petitioning your lord-

ships for similar opportunities of serving their country ?)—neither my known denial of the doctrines of Transubstantiation, and of the supremacy of the Pope, presented the smallest obstacle to my advancement;—neither my merit nor my capacity were weighed in the scale of speculative belief in religious tenets:—it was my country, and not my faith, that was my title to approval:—I was an accredited delegate from the British empire, and *that* was sufficient. I was entrusted with the supreme command of all their forces; I was admitted to their councils; I was called upon for my opinion in the senate; and for the services which I was fortunately enabled to render them, nothing could exceed the prodigality of the reward. The highest honours, the most munificent donations, and perhaps the most splendid presents that ever were bestowed upon a subject, were all showered down upon me, with the most generous profusion. Every succeeding service was met with a fresh eagerness of reward; and, in countries super-eminently Catholic, I was loaded with benefits only equalled by those bestowed upon me by our own Protestant legislature. Indeed, there was not a Catholic state in Europe which was not emulous to overpower me with honourable distinctions, and to place me under an imperative obligation to it. I feel it, therefore, my lords, to be an act of the purest justice, on the one side, and of only reciprocal liberality,

on the other, to lend my most fervent and cordial support to the measure now before you,—to open, to my Catholic fellow-countrymen, the same road to preferment along which *I* have been so generously borne;—and to display to continental Europe our determination to follow the example she has set us, by putting an end to the reign of bigotry and exclusion for ever. My lords, it is a great additional gratification to me, to advocate these principles, in conjunction with a distinguished member of my family, so lately at the head of the government of his native country; a country ever dear to me from the recollections of my infancy, the memory of her wrongs, and the bravery of her people. I glory, my lords, in the name of Ireland, and it is the highest pleasure I can ambition, to be thus united with the rest of my kindred, in the grateful task of closing the wounds which seven centuries of misgovernment have inflicted upon that unfortunate land.

REASONS,

§c. §c.

As those parts of the Oaths and Declarations required of members of Parliament, which touch upon controverted points of Religion, form the basis of this discussion, I will begin with the tenets recited therein, taking them in the order in which they are there introduced.

The Oaths and Declarations to which we object, are as follows :—

“And I do declare, That no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this Realm.”

THE TEST DECLARATION.

“I, *A. B.* do solemnly and sincerely, in the Presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, That I do believe, that in the Sacrament of the Lord’s

Supper, there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the Consecration thereof, by any Person whatsoever ; and that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin *Mary*, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of *Rome*, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the Presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, That I do make this Declaration, and every Part thereof, in the plain and ordinary Sense of the Words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by *English* Protestants."

I will observe, in passing, that we are hereby called upon not only to renounce Catholicity, but to swear to a belief in doctrines, *in the sense in which they are commonly understood by English Protestants* ; hence the necessity of not only shewing, Why we cannot renounce our own Faith, but also, Why we cannot renounce it in favour of other tenets, which we are called upon to embrace in its stead.

I. In the first place, therefore, I cannot either conform to Protestantism, or take the Oaths in question, inasmuch as both call upon me to declare that *no Foreign Prelate hath, or ought to have, any Spiritual Jurisdiction or Pre-eminence, within this Realm* : Whereas, I do solemnly and

sincerely declare, and am ready to attest it with an oath, that I firmly and truly believe in the Primacy of the successor of St. Peter, as regulated by the usages and Canons of the Catholic Church.

The spiritual supremacy over the Christian world was conferred upon St. Peter, by these words of our Saviour :—*Thou art Peter [a rock], and upon this rock I will build my church ; and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it ; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven :^(a)* and again : *Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.^(b)* There is scarcely any instance in which St. Peter is mentioned in the sacred writings without a marked pre-eminence being shown to him over the other apostles ; and consequently over the church of Christ, which they then constituted, or at least represented. This spiritual superiority, (and I beg the reader to bear in mind that it is only *spiritual*, since *the kingdom of Christ is not of this world^(c)*) consists in a right of general superintendence over all orders of the hierarchy ; it is an authority to see that the faith which is preached, is that which was revealed by the Almighty and delivered to us by his Church :

^(a) *St. Matt.* xvi. 18, 19.—N. B. The texts and references from Scripture will be found to correspond with the Douay version of the Bible.

^(b) *St. John*, xxi. 16, 17.

^(c) *St. John*, xviii. 36.

it is a commission to guard the purity of religion, the morality of its pastors, and the integrity of its discipline. "The visible head is for the preservation of a visible unity,"—to continue and connect the chain of faith, for the discovery and condemnation of heresy, and for the due observance of canonical discipline. This, and this alone, is the spiritual supremacy by divine institution, and that only to be exercised in the manner prescribed by the acts of general councils and the canons of the church.^(d) To the bishop of Rome we owe a spiritual obedience as to the successor of St. Peter,

^(d) On this head of the *primacy* of the Roman bishop, the Council of Trent issued no decree; but because in the general Council of Florence, convened in 1439, in order to unite the Greek and Latin churches, the point was fully decided, I shall here insert the decree.

"Moreover we define, that the holy apostolic see, and the Roman bishop, has the primacy over all the earth; and that he is the successor of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of the blessed Peter, was committed by our Lord Jesus Christ, the full power of feeding, directing, and governing the universal church, in such manner as it is contained in the acts of general councils, and in the holy canons."* *Definitio S. Œcumen. Synod. Florent. Conc. Gen. T. xiii. p. 515.*

* Καθ' ὃν τροπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν ὀικεμενικῶν συνοδῶν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανοσι διαλαμβάνεται.

not an allegiance as to a temporal sovereign ; and that spiritual obedience is limited to the points just mentioned. Our temporal obedience to magistrates and rulers is commanded and regulated by the same authority^(e) which imposes a spiritual obedience to spiritual superiors ; to both we owe a like submission, but both are separate and independent of each other.^(f) As the church was built to endure for ever, *even to the consummation of the world*,^(g) so, unquestionably, the government which Christ appointed for it, was to be co-existent with it. A supreme head, a centre of unity, is indeed much more necessary now to preserve *one faith and one baptism*,^(h) in the midst of heresy and

^(e) “ Let every soul be subject to higher powers, for there is no power but from God :....and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.” *Rom.* xiii. 1, 2. “ Be ye subject to every human creature for God’s sake ; whether it be to the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him.” *1 Peter* ii. 13, 14. “ Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” *St. Matt.* xxii. 21.

So strongly is the duty of civil obedience enjoined by the law of God, and by the same law which commands our spiritual obedience to the church : “ *He that will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican.*” *St. Matt.* xviii. 17.

^(f) See *Appendix*, No. II. for some excellent observations on the Spiritual Supremacy.

^(g) *St. Matt.* xxviii. 20.

^(h) *Ephes.* iv. 5.

schism, than when the world was filled with inspired teachers in the persons of the apostles. It is the exercise of this supreme spiritual authority, which has handed down to us both the faith and morality of these disciples of our Saviour, pure and untainted through a course of more than 1,800 years ; and it is the want of this power, lawfully obtained and authoritatively administered, that has produced all those mad and foolish heresies, the prolific growth of protestantism, which, like so many poisonous plants, have banished almost every wholesome fruit from those portions of the garden of christianity in which they have established themselves. There is no blasphemy however wicked, no immorality however monstrous, but, at some period or in some country, has formed part of the faith and practice of sectarianism. Into such absurd impieties has the *reasoning pride of man* beguiled him !

But to confine our remarks to the Church of England.—So necessary did her founders and her patrons consider a spiritual supremacy in their church “ to support the unity of faith and the integrity of christian discipline,”⁽ⁱ⁾ that they established it in the person of the sovereign. But so strange an anomaly as spiritual jurisdiction in a layman, a child, or a woman, and that too usurped

(i) *Preamble of several Acts of Parliament.* See “ *Sermons after Pentecost,*” with illustrations, Vol. i. pp. 140. &c.

from those to whom it had been formally entrusted by the divine authority, could never answer the purpose of repressing error and reforming abuses. Unlawful authority seldom enforces submission. From the moment that the monarch forcibly wrested this power from the successor of St. Peter, and placed it in his own rapacious hands; from that moment all unity disappeared. The chiefs of the state, entangled as they generally are, *with the cares, the riches, and the pleasures of this life,*^(k) had the weakness to acquiesce in so glaring and monstrous an usurpation, and the whole nation became, like the great multitude mentioned in the Scriptures, *as sheep not having a shepherd.*^(l) Each individual ranged at large in the fields of speculative belief—he spurned at the ridiculous assumption of spiritual pre-eminence by a civil magistrate, and instead of obeying his mandates, each one, in imitation of the monarch, took the same authority upon himself, and thereafter placed the foundations of his faith upon the tottering basis of private interpretation. The evils which followed have been thus forcibly described by a learned and eloquent pastor of the Catholic Church:—

“ Spite of royal mandates, of royal canons, and royal censures, error in every varied, versatile, and frightful form, continued to erect new temples; and

^(k) *St. Luke*, viii. 14.

^(l) *St. Mark*, vi. 34.

the nation presented to the astonished world a scene of folly, bigotry, and superstition, striking and preposterous, as any that curiosity can trace in the lengthened annals of fanaticism. Such were the consequences of pretending to enforce unity of belief by means which Revelation has not sanctioned." (*Sermons after Pentecost*, p. 142.)

Such were the miserable effects of the usurpation of unlawful power, and of rebellion to just authority. The almost universal conflict of religious opinions, and the swarm of meeting-houses of every description which still continue to spring up around us, will enable us to judge whether time has diminished the fruits of such a system.

But, fully satisfied of my utter inability to offer any thing in illustration of this doctrine of the spiritual supremacy,—a doctrine so important in itself, and against which the Test is so pointedly directed,—at all equal to the following eloquent and spirited argument of the titular Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin : I will insert the observations of that talented and learned Prelate, without further comment.

"But where," says he, "there is question of the promise of the keys to Peter, and of the command given to him to feed the lambs, the sheep, the whole flock of God, then antiquity, like a torrent, sweeps away all opposition, every obstacle which a perverse sophistry would at any period, oppose to

the supremacy of this Apostle. All the Fathers, for I know of no exception, consider him as representing the whole Church, and receiving from Christ, in his own single person, the keys or power of its government, to be exercised by himself and by his brethren with due subordination to him as chief or head."

Here the writer introduces his authorities ; for which I must refer the reader to the work itself, as they are too numerous for insertion here. He then proceeds :

" But why is this venerable host of primitive pastors and doctors drawn forth in order to prove the primacy or supremacy of Peter ? Why, because for my purpose, it is necessary to bring back the minds of readers to the primitive form of the Church, and to the ground-work of Christianity, which in these times of religious intemperance and fanaticism, seem to be entirely overlooked. Political economy, or the art of founding joint-stock companies, are scarcely the subjects at present of less rational speculation than the Testament or religion of Jesus Christ. One creates a company for the conversion of the Jews, another for enlightening the Hindoos, a third undertakes to instruct the Blacks who border on the Cape, a fourth will emancipate from spiritual despotism the Slaves in Barbadoes, or the more miserable Irish ; one proclaims the necessity of Prelates, and boasts of the beauty of his liturgy ;

a second says, liturgies embarrass the spirit in its flight, and why should those made free by Christ be subjected to the rule of Bishops? One system of religion is suited to the wealthy and the proud, having order, pomp, and ceremony; the other, coarse, irregular, and loud, fitted to the peasant or mechanic. The word of God, the Bible, is on the lips of all; the right and power of private judgment are unreasonably extolled—the sacraments are neglected—the ministry superseded—and whilst fanaticism thus burns on the surface, immorality weighs upon the heart, whilst infidelity, secretly and silently advancing, prepares to erect its standard on the ruins which this fanaticism will have made. If men do not return to first principles, and arrest their minds in their present course; if they do not review the Christian religion, not as presented in the passing declamations of the day, but as it was originally established by the Spirit of God, no gift of prophecy is required to foresee how lamentable are the results which press upon us. To bring back the public attention, then, to the consideration of the leading maxims of the primitive Church, is deserving at least of an effort, but besides this motive, it was necessary for my special purpose to show how unity (so essential to the kingdom of Christ,) was preserved in the immense society of true believers.

“ It was with this view principally that I endeavoured to demonstrate that a primacy was given to St. Peter—a prerogative which vested him with power as extensive as the Church, and which might, and ought when necessary, be exercised over every sheep within the fold of Christ, of whatever rank or order.

“ The language of the Redeemer, as quoted by me, from the 16th chapter of his gospel according to St. Matthew, shows of itself that the authority given to Peter was to last as long as the Church, for if he were made the foundation of it after Christ, the rock on which it was built, it is perfectly obvious that as long as the superstructure lasted, the foundation could not be removed ; in other words, that as long as a Church was to remain on earth, the authority given to Peter should continue to it—that so long as the kingdom of heaven or city of God, continued in this world, so long should some person be vested with the keys of government—that as long as there would be a fold of sheep and lambs, so long there should be a pastor to feed them in the place of Peter—in fine, that as long as the faithful were to be one body, saying the same thing, and not having divisions among them, so long there should be some person vested with power to enforce obedience—to collect the sentiments of the body—to publish its acts—to institute or sanction its officers—to

preach and cause to be preached the doctrines of Christ—to dispense and cause to be dispensed the mysteries of God, that so the people might obey their prelates and be subject to them, that the prelates might not lord it over the people, but be made patterns to them from the heart; in fine, that all might have one faith, and not be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, but be kept united in that common charity which is the great source, as it is the bond, of perfection.

“But this consequence, however plain and necessary—however spontaneously flowing from the very source of christianity, yet it has been contradicted, and seldom more violently, or at least less temperately, than at the present day. The furious men who now agitate this country, seem to know that the sword and the law could not have been drawn, or, if drawn, could not have been wielded with such deadly effect against the holy and ancient religion of these islands, if that religion had not first been decried, abused, and maligned, until it appeared to the multitude a very moral monster. ‘From the sole of its foot,’ like its founder, ‘to the top of its head, there was no soundness in it’; it was buffeted, abused, spit upon; it was covered with a mantle of derision; it was scourged, and drenched with vinegar and gall: the waters of affliction entered into its very soul, and it was, when thus disfigured by a cla-

morous rabble, and seemingly abandoned by God, that the bigots and the fanatic cried out to the agents of the law and the sword,—‘away with it, away with it.’

“ But as there was no tenet of this religion more opposed to the machinations of those furious and designing men, nor again, no tenet more strongly supported by argument, by the practice of the Church, and an undisputed possession of fifteen hundred years, than that of the supremacy of the successor of St. Peter, so there was no tenet against which their sophistry, their misrepresentations, their violence, their rancour and persecution were so unceasingly directed. To such extremities did these men proceed, as not only to confound the power claimed by some few popes of Rome over the temporal interests or rights of kings and kingdoms, with the spiritual jurisdiction of St. Peter’s successor, but, in addition to this misrepresentation, they actually designated not one or other, but a whole series of those successors, as Antichrists, and excited the deluded multitude to hate them and curse them as the capital enemies of our Lord and Saviour. Yes, the very men who maintained from the beginning, and still maintain, against an infidel or Arian world the divinity of the Son of God; the very men who designate themselves as the last of his servants, and who, without any doubt, have caused his name to be published and adored

throughout nearly the whole christian world, these men who never ask any thing of the Father except through the Son, and identify him in their daily prayer with the King of Ages, the immortal and invisible God, to whom alone are due and given all honor and glory, these very men have been called, by the ferocious leaders of the revolt, ‘Antichrists’!! and the Church in which they have always presided, and whose faith was from the beginning, and still is spoken of throughout the entire world,—this Church they called ‘Babylon,’ and the ‘great apostacy,’ with all manner of opprobrious and insulting names.

“To the present day, this warfare of calumny is continued for the same purposes, and by the genuine successors of the wicked men who first commenced it; hence it necessarily enters into the design of these observations that I endeavour, not to dissipate the cloud of calumny which still prevails, (a task to which I confess my incompetency), but to prove, in addition to the argument adduced by me, that the supremacy given to Peter has passed to his successors, the bishop, for the time being, of the See of Rome.

“This is a truth, like many others, connected with a matter of fact, and a fact which, as it commenced with the demise of Peter, cannot be found recorded in the Holy Scriptures; but it is, at the same time, as we have seen above, a truth flowing

necessarily from the institution by Christ, of the primacy in the person of that apostle; and all antiquity, as it attests the existence of that primacy in Peter, so it attests the transmission of it to his successors in the See of Rome.

“ The law of nature sanctions a presumption in favour of him who has the peaceable possession of any thing, and he is supposed to have acquired it justly, until his title to it is disproved. The burden of proof lies on him who questions the right of possession, and not upon him who holds it; but when we Catholics call for this proof against the title of Peter’s successor to the spiritual supremacy which he enjoys, we are replied to by loud declamation, by angry invective, or by visionary speculations on the Apocalypse. If we refer to historical records to show not only the possession, but also the exercise of this supremacy in every age from the apostolic times, we are told that Mosheim (the faithless Hume of the Protestant Churches,) says, that the early churches, like the Greek republics, were all independent one of the other, and their councils like the amphycionie assemblies. To refute this folly we refer to Eusebius, to Fleury, to Natalis Alexander; we present the long and accurate catalogue of cases compiled by Cardinal Perron for the information of King James the First, to show that no Church was ever independent of the head of the episcopacy—that he

exercised in every quarter of the known world a jurisdiction commensurate with the exigency of the case which required it. We exhibit the appeals made to him from each of the three great patriarchates, as well as from all parts of his own in the West, and refer to the decisions pronounced by him—we mention the names and the sees of the bishops whom he acquitted or deposed—the nature of the discipline which he sanctioned or reprovèd—the errors and heresies which he condemned. We refer to the councils in which he presided either in person or by his delegates, from the time when councils were first held; we produce copies of his instructions to his legates, whether proceeding to the East or to the West; his confirmation or rejection of the whole or of a part of their proceedings; his spiritual pre-eminence asserted by him, and for him, and admitted with acclamation by all the orthodox, whether in council or dispersed, and never disputed unless by the wicked, the refractory, and the rebellious—the successors of Core, of Dathan, of Jannes and Mambre. We appeal to argument and common sense;—but the spirit of the *great revolt* from the just authority established by Christ in his Church, answers to us, saying; “Obedience, that great virtue by which all were justified by one, is no more to be practised; there are no longer judges in the Church, every believer is to judge for himself; he who

separates himself no longer, sins by so doing ; the man who chooses for himself, setting at nought the judgment of those appointed to teach all nations and rule the Church, is no longer condemned by his own judgment ; no man is obliged to hear the Church, as if Christ spoke through her ; every old man and silly woman is now competent to decide on all controversies ; a man may think on religion as he pleases, and speak as he thinks, nor is there any one entitled to reprove him and cast him out among the heathens. The day of gospel liberty is at length arrived, we have been freed, not from the yoke of Jewish observances, which neither we nor our fathers could bear, and made the children of God, under the dominion of Christ and of his heavenly grace, but we have been freed from all restraint upon our will or passions, upon our reason or fancy, and totally exempted from all obedience to those pastors who were formerly appointed to watch, so as if to give to God an account of our souls. We want no teacher, for the unction of God teaches us all things, even the most contradictory, illusive, and impious ; we may now without danger be tossed about by every wind of doctrine ; no unity of belief is required of us ; we need not worship at the same altar, nor partake of the same sacraments, nor hear the voice of the same pastor ; the body of Christ has undergone a thorough reformation ; it is now a mass of hete-

rogeneous, discordant, and conflicting members, the head and the foot and the hand each goes its own way, and performs its own function independent of the other; in a word, there has been *a great and entire revolt* from the mutual dependance, the well regulated obedience, the singleness of faith, the uniformity of discipline, the brotherhood of charity which was originally established and prevailed. Formerly, the believers had but one heart and one mind, now no two of them are of the same mind; formerly all said the same thing, nor were there any schisms among them, now no two persons say the same thing, and schisms are multiplied without end or number; formerly there was but one church, one font of baptism, one altar in the town or village, now there are as many churches or conventicles as streets, some with, and some without an altar, some having a font for baptism, others having no such means of regeneration; in this only are we all agreed—to condemn the faith of our fathers, and to dissent from each other in all things else.

“We speak sometimes about essentials, and non-essentials, but incapable of ascertaining what should be designated by those terms, we say the Bible, and the Bible alone is our religion (a tolerably sized one, it must be confessed), and in its interpretation we seek only a justification of discord and the condemnation of unity.

“ But leaving this view of the subject, painful, and at the same time ludicrous, if the follies of Christian men could be a just subject of ridicule, let us proceed with a sketch of the doctrine of antiquity relative to the supremacy of the See of Rome.”

Here again follow the citations, and for which, as they are copious, I must again refer the reader to the work.— He then continues :

“ I have selected these few passages from the acts of councils holden in the Eastern or Greek Church, composed almost exclusively of Bishops residing outside the western Patriarchate, which was still more closely connected with the Pope, and more faithful at all times in adhering to the apostolic doctrine, and to that centre of union by which it is preserved. I have referred to those councils, because they are admitted as general and orthodox by all; because matters of the greatest moment were discussed and decided in them, such as dogmas of faith, and the guilt or innocence, not of ordinary individuals, or Bishops, but of two great patriarchs, the one of Constantinople, the other of Alexandria; I have referred to them as to large mirrors, in which may be clearly seen the faith and discipline of that pure and primitive Church, which sectaries pretend to revere; and introduced them as the depositaries of the doctrine which prevailed throughout all the orthodox

churches of the then Christian world ;—as bodies of Pastors and Doctors, declaring, not by their language alone, but by their conduct, on the most important occasions which could occur, that the Pope of Rome was the successor of Peter, and, as such, the head of the whole Church, possessing the right to preside in synods wheresoever held, to give judgment in matters of faith, whether provisionally or finally, and to try, punish or acquit the most exalted of his colleagues.

“ I was about to cite, as in the case of Peter’s supremacy, the testimony of the ancient Fathers, Greek and Latin, in support of the doctrine maintained at Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, but I find those preliminary observations have already extended to a greater length than I anticipated. The opinions on this subject of SS. Irenæus, Dennis of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and of Theodoret, all Greeks :—and of the Latins, Tertullian, SS. Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Optatus, Augustin, Fulgentius ; of Vincent of Lerins, and the others up to St. Bernard inclusive, may be read, in any of our books of theology ; so that, as far as human testimony can add security and stability to a right evidently founded on the power and wisdom, and will of Christ—a right essential to the preservation of unity in the faith and integrity in the Church—a right confirmed by an undisturbed, how-often-soever-assailed possession of eighteen

centuries, so far is the spiritual supremacy, and no other, of the Pope eminently supported and secured; so far is the Church of Rome, the head and mistress of all other churches, the depository of christian truth, the guardian of discipline, and the centre of unity, to which, in the language of Irænaeus, 'all the faithful, wheresoever dispersed, should come in christian harmony and with one accord.' Nor can we more appropriately conclude these few general observations on the nature and doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, whose authority is so reviled by furious men, than with the following striking passage, extracted from the Pastoral Instructions, addressed, in 1824, by all the Irish Catholic Bishops to their flocks. These prelates, instructing the Catholics of Ireland, observe: 'but above all to protect you against these men who *are erring and driving into error*, you have the infallible testimony of the Church of God, which Jesus Christ appointed the depository of his doctrine, to preserve it, to explain it, to teach it, promising her that she would always be animated and directed by the Holy Ghost, and that he himself would be constantly assisting her till the 'end of time; that the gates of hell would never prevail against this bulwark, which, as an Apostle says, 'is the pillar and ground of the truth.'⁽ⁿ⁾ The Re-

⁽ⁿ⁾ 1Tim. c. 3. v. 15. See also Matt. 16. v. 18, and John 14. v. 16, 17.

deemer foresaw how great would be the inconstancy, the rashness, the pride, the rebellion of the mind of man, and that many even of those who would venerate the holy Scriptures, would, in searching into their depths, loose the anchor of faith, see vain things, and prophecy lies, saying and persevering to say, 'the Lord speaketh,' when as Ezekiel saith, 'the Lord had not sent them.'^(a) He foresaw that such men would create dissensions, bring in sects and broach heresies, would oppose authority, contradict the truth, fluctuate in a chaos of unsettled opinions, be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, condemn each other, and yet all cry out, '*so saith the Lord,*' *ait Dominus*, whilst they all rejected what the Lord had said. He foresaw that these sects, turbulent and licentious, known, and scarcely known, by the names of their founders, would break the unity of his mystic body, which is the Church, of which he himself is the Head ; of that Church which has but ONE FAITH, as she has but ONE SAVIOUR, ONE BAPTISM, and ONE LORD ; and hence it was that he vested in her an infallible authority, which, like a light always shining, could dissipate the darkness of error, remove every doubt, interpret faithfully the Word of God, and conduct mankind into the haven of truth and salvation. And where can this Church be found, unless it be she which was

built on the Apostles, which received from them the true sense and meaning of the Scriptures, and which, at her very commencement, decided the disputes, and settled the doubts which arose amongst the faithful, whilst the Holy Ghost dictated her decision; 'it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.'^(p)

“Where can this Church be found, if it be not she who from that time to the present, has subsisted and been governed by an uninterrupted succession of pastors?—she who was always unchangeable in her faith and morality, and who, like her divine Founder, was yesterday, is to-day, and will be always the same, till the consummation of ages; that Church, which amongst all the sects which have sprung up about her, or proceed from her bosom, has always, as the pagan Celsus testifies, been known by the name of THE GREAT CHURCH;—that Church, which has condemned all other Churches, which, like withered branches, were lopped off from the ancient [and living trunk, whose root is Christ; that Church which has triumphed over so many persecutions excited against her by the Jews, by the Pagans, by the impious, by all the enemies of her doctrine; a Church always assailed and never conquered! In a word, where can this Church be found, if it

^(p). Acts, ch. 15. v. 8.

be not she which is extended throughout the entire world, which alone is one, which alone can glory in the title of CATHOLIC—a title which she has borne from the apostolic times, which her enemies themselves concede to her, and which, if arrogated by any of them, serves only to expose their shame.

“In this Church, dearly beloved brethren, you possess the fountain of all true knowledge, and the tribunal where God himself presides. He speaks to you by the mouths of all her pastors, whom, when you hear, you hear him.⁽⁹⁾ Never deviate from her decisions, they are the decisions of the Holy Ghost, who governs her, and always preserves the purity of her doctrine. Never attend to any voice but to her’s, she is the tender mother who has brought you forth, who has nursed you in her bosom, fed you with milk from her breasts in your infancy, and now furnishes you with strong food. She watches unceasingly over the deposit of the faith which has been confided to her by her heavenly spouse; she is always armed against every error, against every impiety, always shining in the midst of the disorder and confusion of this world, like the morning star from the midst of the clouds, to direct her children in the ways of truth and salvation. Watch,

⁽⁹⁾ Luc. 10. v. 16.

therefore, we again beseech you by the mercy of God, remain firm, do not fall from your steadfastness, be constant in the faith; repel with meekness, but with the zeal of God, all the assaults of those who would seduce you; be strengthened and animated with the aid of divine grace against all the ungodly, against all enthusiasts and impostors; *watch, stand in the faith, act manfully, and be comforted.*"^(r) 1 Cor. ch. 16. v. 13.

II. In the second place, I can neither conform to Protestantism, nor take the Oaths required, because both call upon me *to profess, testify, and declare, solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God*, not merely that I do not believe in Transubstantiation, but that I *believe* there is no such thing as Transubstantiation; and moreover, that what I do believe on this point, I believe in the sense in which it is *commonly* understood by *English* Protestants: not after the definition of any Christian Church; not in any precise terms, such as might be intelligible to the understanding; not from any authority remote or recent, but according to the sense in which it is commonly understood by a body of men who own no authority in matters of faith, but their own judgment; who

^(r) *Reply to the Most Reverend Dr. Magee, by J. K. L.* pp. 35-56.—See also a learned Examination of the Supremacy of St. Peter, in Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*, in answer to Dr. Burgess, bishop of St. David's.

think on all controverted points as their fancy may dictate; and who have no standard of orthodoxy to refer to for the explanation of their doctrine. The thirty-nine articles, and the Church Catechism, are both incompetent to the purpose, since, in this case, it appears to remain quite undetermined whether we are to believe the body and blood of Christ truly and really present in the sacrament, or not. At least, I think no one will be bold enough to attempt to define, in any thing like intelligible terms, what *is* the doctrine of the English Protestants on this head. Is it not then most unreasonable to require us to swear to a belief in doctrines, the exposition of which we really know not where to find? While the thirty-nine articles and the Church Catechism leave us quite in the dark as to what we really are to believe, the Prelates of the establishment do not at all elucidate the matter by their discordant and contradictory opinions, leaving us still to guess at what is the common belief of English Protestants upon the doctrines to which we are required to swear. If we look to the earlier periods of the history of English Protestantism, we shall find some of its most distinguished Divines holding the following opinions: ^(r)

“We agree as to the *object*,” says Dr. Andrews

^(r) See *The Faith and Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church proved by the Testimony of the most learned Protestants*. Dublin, 1813.

of Winchester, "the *whole* difference respects the *modus* or *manner* of the presence.... We believe a real and a true presence, no less than you do. The King too (James I.) believes Christ not only *really* present, but *truly adorable* in the Eucharist, and I myself do adore the very flesh of Christ in the mysteries."^(r)

Dr. Lawrence thus expresses himself: "As I like not those who say he is *bodily* there, so I like not those who say his body is *not there*: because Christ says it is there; St. Paul says it is there; and our Church says it is there, really, truly, and essentially, and not only by way of representation or commemoration. For why would our Saviour bid us take what he would not have us receive? We must believe it is there. We must know what is there. Our faith may see it: our senses cannot."^(s)

Archbishop Laud says, "The altar is the greatest place of God's residence on earth: yea, greater than the pulpit; for there it is, *Hoc est corpus meum*: in the pulpit it is, at most, *Hoc est verbum meum*. And a greater reverence is due to the *body* than to the word of the Lord; and to the throne where he is usually present, than to the seat where his word is preached."^(t)

^(r) *Answer to Card. Bellarmine's Apology*, chap. 1, p. 11, and chap. 8, p. 194.

^(s) Lawrence's *Sermon*, p. 17—18.

^(t) *Speech in the Star Chamber*, p. 47.

And yet the Bishop of Peterborough tells us, that at this very time [in the reign of Charles I.], the Church of England professed the SAME *true* religion which it professes at present."^(u)

"Concerning the point of the real presence," says Dr. Montague, "there need be no difference, if men were disposed as they ought to peace; for the disagreement is only *de modo Presentiæ*; the thing being yielded to on either side: viz. that there is in the Eucharist a real presence."^(x)

Bishop Bramhall writes thus: "No genuine son of the Church [of England] did ever deny a true, real presence. Christ said: *This is my body*, and what he said we steadfastly believe," &c.^(y)

Bishop Cosin is not less explicit in favour of the Catholic Doctrine. He says: "It is a monstrous error to deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist," &c.^(z)

Hooker thus expresses himself: "Sith we all agree that Christ, by the sacrament, doth really and truly perform in us his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation."^(a)

^(u) *Charge*, p. 16.—1827. ^(x) *Appeal to Cæsar*, p. 289.

^(y) *Answer to M. de la Militière*, p. 74. ^(z) *Hist. of Transubstantiation*, p. 139. ^(a) *Eccles. Polity*, B. v. 67.

Will it be believed that these, and many others who held the same opinions, were all eminent divines, and members of the English Protestant Church, some of them posterior to the last revisal of the 39 Articles,^(b) and only a very few years prior to the time^(c) when members of Parliament were called upon to swear precisely to what they are at the present moment; namely, that they believed this doctrine in the sense in which it was *commonly* understood by English Protestants.

But while the oath remains the same, the doctrine appears to have differed; preserving only one characteristic of its former qualities—that of being as vague and indeterminate as ever. While the creed of the Established Church always appears at first sight to inculcate a true and real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, it invariably alters its course, either by admitting every possible variety of opinion, through the vagueness of its definitions; or, by Catechistical

^(b) In 1634, the Convocation of the Irish Bishops denounced an excommunication against those who affirmed that any of the articles of the Church of England were *in any part superstitious or erroneous*. Twenty-eight years afterwards, they were discovered to be both.

^(c) Dr. Andrews died 1626; Laud (executed) 1644; Montague, 1641; Archbishop Bramhall, 1663; Cosin, 1671; Hooker, 1660; Parker, 1575; Nowell, 1602; Taylor, 1667; Wake, 1736; Usher, 1656.

explanations, doing away with the reality of the presence altogether ; or by stating things in such contradictory terms, that it still contrives to leave the doctrine itself involved in mystery, doubt, and darkness. “ Its original framers knew that the Christian world was divided into two parties : the one consisting of the Catholics and the Lutherans, who contended for the real presence of Christ’s body, though they differed as to the manner of that presence ; the other of the Zuinglians and Calvinists, who rejected the real presence and admitted nothing more than a bare figure and memorial of the death of Christ. By appearing to admit both opinions into different parts of the articles, catechism, and rubrics, they opened a door for proselytes from either party, who might thus become orthodox churchmen, and still retain their favourite opinions. Thus, the original articles published by the authority of Edward VI. contained a long paragraph against ‘ the real and bodily presence,’ as they term it ;^(d) which paragraph, though it was subscribed by both houses of Convocation, in the reign of Elizabeth, was omitted by the command

(d) The first communion service, drawn up by Cranmer, Ridley, and other Protestant bishops and divines, and published in 1548, clearly expresses the real presence, declaring that “ the whole body of Christ is received under each particle of the Sacrament.” *Burnet, T. ii. p. 1.*

of that female head of the Church." "The design of government," says Burnet, "was at that time much turned to the drawing over the body of the nation to the reformation, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament; therefore it was thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter, in which the very word *real presence* was rejected."^(e) In like manner, in the second Book of Common Prayer, published by Edward VI., was inserted a long rubric, rejecting "*all adoration unto any real presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.*" This also was laid aside by order of Elizabeth. "It being the Queen's design," says Wheatley, "to unite the nation as much as she could in one faith, it was therefore recommended to the divines, to see there should be no definition made against the aforesaid notion, but that it should remain as a speculative opinion not determined, but in which every one might be left to the freedom

^(e) Burnet, *Exposition of the xxxix Articles*, p. 308.

"This part of the article was omitted, in 1562, probably with a view to give less offence to those who maintained the corporeal presence, and to comprehend as many as possible in the established church." Bishop of Lincoln's *Elements of Christian Theology*, vol. 2, p. 483.

of his own mind."^(f) King James imitated the caution of his predecessor ; and in commissioning Bishop Overal, then Dean of St. Paul's, to add to the catechism the explanation of the Sacraments, he was careful that the real presence should be taught in such a manner as might satisfy the patrons of that doctrine.^(g)

The 28th Article of the Church of England declares that " the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." Catholics say the same. " The Holy Synod openly and plainly professes that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially present under the appearances of those sensible objects. Nor in this is there any repugnance, that Christ, according to his natural manner of existence, should always remain in heaven at the right hand of his father ; and that, at the same time, he should be present with us, in many places, really, but sacramentally, in that way of existence which, though in words we can hardly express it, the mind, illuminated by faith, can conceive to be possible to God, and which we are

^(f) Wheatley's *Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 334.

^(g) See Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*.

bound firmly to believe ; for so all our ancestors, as many as were members of the true Church of Christ, who wrote on the subject of this holy sacrament, openly professed.”^(h)

Dean Nowell, in his *Catechism for Schools*, first published in 1570, says the same. “ The body and blood of Christ are given to the faithful in the Lord’s Supper, are received, eat, and drank by them, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, *but truly and really* [*verè tamen atque reipsâ*]. So that when it was asserted by a Catholic controvertist, that, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, the bread of the supper is but a figure of Christ, Bishop Montague had some reason to answer ; “ Is but a sign, or figure, and no more !—Strange !—and yet our formal words are, *This is my body ; this is my blood*. *This is*, is more than this *figureth*, or *designeth* : a bare figure is but a phantasm. He gave *substance*, and *really subsisting essence*, who said, “ This is my body, this is my blood.”⁽ⁱ⁾

“ I know,” says the elegant and learned writer from whom this argument is taken, “ that both this divine, and others who have held a similar language, have on other occasions taught the contrary doctrine ; but this corroborates my assertion, since it shews that in endeavouring to defend

^(h) *Council of Trent*, Sess. xiii. c. 1. p. 86.

⁽ⁱ⁾ *New Gag*. p. 250. 1624.

the tenets of the established creed, they were compelled, first, to acknowledge a real presence, and then to explain it away till it meant a real absence." The article says, "the body of Christ is *given*, &c."—Now, Archbishop Wake's catechism, entitled, *The Principles of the Christian Religion Explained*, asks this question: "Are the body and blood of Christ really distributed to every communicant in this sacrament?" And the answer is, "*No, they are not.* For then, every communicant, whether prepared or not, would alike receive Christ's body and blood there." Is not this contradictory to the Article? The Article says, "the body of Christ is *given*;"—the Archbishop's catechism, that it is *not* given. "That which is *given*," says he, "by the priest to the communicant, is, as to its nature, the same after the consecration that it was before; viz. bread and wine, only altered as to its *use* and signification." He says again: "That which is given by the priest, is, as to its substance, bread and wine; as to its sacramental nature and signification, it is the figure or representation of Christ's body and blood, which was broken and shed for us. The very body and blood of Christ *as yet it is not.* But being with faith and piety received by the communicant, it becomes to him, by the blessing of God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, *the very body and blood of Christ.*"—We have seen, that the Article at first says the body of Christ is *really* present, for

how can it be *given*, if it be not there? yet at last it asserts that it is *not* there; and that to bring it there, it must first be *received* by faith. In the Archbishop's definition a real and true presence is also expressed; and yet when the Bishop asks *how* the bread and wine become to the faithful and worthy communicant the very body and blood of Christ, he replies: "*As* it entitles him to a part in the sacrifice of his death, and to the benefits thereby procured to all his faithful and obedient servants!" If this has any meaning at all, it signifies that, instead of a real presence of the body and blood of Christ, there is in the sacrament *a title to the inheritance of the merits of his death*; that is, some spiritual benefit, but by no means the *very body and blood of Christ*, as he had said before!

The late Bishop of Durham, in his celebrated *Explanation* of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, thus expresses himself: "To eat Christ, is to incorporate with the mind the spiritual food of faith and righteousness. To eat Christ, is to imbibe his doctrines, to digest his precepts, and to live by his example. We eat Christ, by having him in our minds, and meditating on his life and sufferings. To eat Christ, is to believe in him; and to eat his flesh is to keep up the remembrance of him, especially of his death. To eat the body of Christ, therefore, and to drink his blood at the sacrament, are *figurative* terms to denote an act

of faith, by which we profess our faith in Christ, and commemorate his death, by eating the *representative* and *vicarious elements of bread and wine*." Hence, to eat the body and drink the blood of Christ, is to eat, not his body, but bread, as a representation and substitute for his body; and to drink, not his blood, but wine, as a representation and substitute for his blood. Yet, a few pages afterwards the Bishop says: "To think and believe, are as really acts of the mind, as to eat is an act of the body. What is done by the mind, is as truly done, as what is done by the body. The body of Christ is therefore *as truly, as verily, and indeed*, received by faith, as the bread is by the mouth?"—What are we to understand from all this? *What is the sense in which ENGLISH Protestants understand it?* I confess that to me it is wholly and entirely unintelligible and contradictory; but not one tittle the more so than every other *explanation* of this doctrine to be found in Catechisms, Charges, Sermons, or even in the Articles of Faith of the Established Church.^(h)

But it is useless to multiply proofs of the discordant opinions of prelates and members of the establishment of the present day, and to show that too many of them reject the real presence

^(h) See this argument pursued more at length in Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*.

altogether, and attempt to explain the whole by a *figurative* meaning. I will only notice another and a very remarkable instance of the contrariety of opinions between prelates of the Established Church at the time when the oath was framed, and of the period in which we live. When the Duke of York asked Archbishop Sheldon, in the time of Charles II., if it were the doctrine of the Church of England, that Roman Catholics were idolators? he answered, "*that it was not* ; but that young men of parts would be popular, and such a charge was the way to it."⁽ⁱ⁾ While in the reign of George IV., Dr. Burgess, Bishop of St. David's, tells us that "they who do not hold the worship of the Church of Rome to be idolatrous, *are not Protestants*, whatever they may profess to be!"^(k) I would ask, whether contradictions and absurdities like these were ever found in Catholicity?

Hence it appears clear, that the oath no longer bears the same signification now that it did when it was first established, and may at any time go round again to the sense in which English Protestants held it in former times ; but not, perhaps, till, cameleon-like, it has caught a dozen different hues, from the colour of the politics or fancies of the day ; for it seldom happens that the opinions of

⁽ⁱ⁾ Burnet, *Hist. of his own Times*. 1673.

^(k) *Protestant's Catechism*, p. 46.

men pass from one position to its reverse, except through numerous gradations. Is it not, then, preposterous to call upon us to swear to so variable, contradictory, and incomprehensible a doctrine as this appears to be in the hands of English Protestants?⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ See *note* at the foot of p. 155.

The contrariety of opinion that has ever been so remarkable amongst the prelates of the Establishment in England, appears likewise to have prevailed about this same period in the Irish branch of the Protestant church. While many of the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, with Archbishop Usher at their head, declared that "the religion of the Papists was superstitious and idolatrous," &c.; and "that to consent that they might freely exercise their religion, was a grievous sin:"* Dr. Jeremy Taylor, bishop of Down, much to his credit for candour and discernment, says; "The object of their [the Catholics] adoration in the sacrament is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically united with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the sacrament; and if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread, that they profess it idolatry to do so. This is demonstration that the soul has nothing in it that is idolatrical; the will has nothing in it but what is a great enemy to idolatry."† About the same time, in England, Thorndyke, prebendary of Westminster, argues thus: "Will any Papist acknowledge that he honours the *elements* of the Eucharist for God? Will common sense charge him with honouring

* See Plowden's *Hist. of Ireland*, vol. i. c. 4.

† *Liberty of Prophecy*, Sect. 20.

But even if I knew what I was called upon to believe, yet, under the view which I take of the

that in the sacrament, which he does not believe to be there?"† But Dr. Porteus, bishop of London, a few years ago, charged Catholics with "senseless idolatry," and with "worshipping the creature instead of the creator."§ It is really extraordinary, but not less true, that prelates and divines of the Church of England should, in this enlightened age, require to be sent back to periods of comparative barbarism (when there was at least as much inflammable matter in the polemical world, as there is at present) to learn candour, fair dealing, liberality, charity, and common sense. Let them take a lesson from Dr. Parker; and, while they blush at the contrast, would to God they would apply his reasoning in the cause to which his candid mind directed it, namely, the abrogation of the Test. "So black a crime as idolatry," says he, "is not lightly to be charged upon any party of Christians, on account of the foulness of the calumny, and the barbarous consequences that may follow upon it. Before so bloody an indictment is preferred against the *greatest* part of the Christian world, the thing should be well understood. The charge is too big for a scolding word. It is a piece of inhumanity that outdoes the ferocity of the cannibal, and damns at once both soul and body; and yet after all, we have no other ground than the rash assertions of some popular divines, *who have no other measures of truth than hatred to Popery*, and therefore never spare hard words against that church; running up all objections against it into

† *Just Weights and Measures*, c. 19.

§ *Confut.* p. ii. c. 1.

question, I could not possibly subscribe to any such misconstructions of the ancient doctrine of Christendom on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist: For, in conformity with this doctrine, I most firmly and steadfastly believe, and am ready solemnly and sincerely to call God to witness my belief, that Transubstantiation does verily and truly take place in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and in the manner in which it is taught and explained in the Catholic Church.

In the first place, I believe it because the Catholic Church has always taught it; she has taught it, because it was revealed to her from heaven; and

atheism and blasphemy, of which idolatry is the greatest instance. As to the use of images in the worship of God, I cannot but wonder at the confidence of these men to make so bold a charge against them in general, when the images of the cherubims were commanded by God himself (*Exod. xxv. 18.*); which instance is so plain and obvious to every reader, there being nothing more remarkable in all the Old Testament than the honour done to the cherubim, that 'tis a much greater wonder to me, that those men who advance the objection of idolatry so groundlessly, can so slightly rid themselves of so pregnant a proof against it; till therefore it can be proved that the papists worship the images of false gods as supreme deities, or the true God by corporal images and the representations of his divine nature, there can be no footing for idolatry in Christendom."||

|| *Parker's Reasons for abrogating the Test.*

of its revelation from heaven there is abundant and incontrovertible proof. Yes, if there be one tenet of Christianity more clearly defined, or more frequently illustrated in the sacred writings than another; if there be one article of faith which it appeared to be the object of our Saviour to enforce more strongly upon our minds than usual; if there be one mystery to which more importance is given, or to which more consequence is attached, it is the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is a singular circumstance, that Transubstantiation should have been the characteristic both of the first and of the last miracle which our Saviour performed in the course of his sacred ministry,—the conversion of water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana, and the conversion of bread into his body, and of wine into his blood, at the last supper.

Like every other tenet of her creed, the Catholic Church can trace the belief in Transubstantiation up to the very æra of the Apostles, by an unbroken series of authentic history, by the luminous evidence of those unexceptionable attestators of truth, the Fathers of the Church.^(m)

But why should we have recourse to the testimony of history, and the opinion of the Fathers, while we have the evidence of the Scripture, and the words of Christ himself to guide us? It is impos-

^(m) See APPENDIX, p. xviii, where these testimonies are adduced at some length.

sible for any one, with an unbiassed judgment, to read the 6th chapter of the Gospel of St. John, and disbelieve in the real and substantial presence of the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. We there see the express declaration of Christ : *I am the bread of life ; the bread that I will give is my flesh :*⁽ⁿ⁾ and we see the sense in which his words were understood, and the manner in which they were received, by the unbelieving Jews, who incredulously asked ; *How can this man give us his flesh to eat ?* Instead of denying that this was his real and literal meaning, and undeceiving

⁽ⁿ⁾ It may be here observed, “ that if Christ had wished to inculcate the Catholic doctrine, he could not have done it in terms better adapted to the purpose ; and if he meant to inculcate the doctrine of the Church of England, he could hardly have selected words more likely to lead his disciples into error.” (Lingard’s *Tracts*, p. 215.)

During the period of our Saviour’s sojournment upon earth, he was God under the *appearance* of man ; and though he proved his divinity by miracles, yet those miracles were momentary and passing, and left mankind without any evidence that was perceptible by the senses, in testimony of so incomprehensible a mystery as a God made man. And why should we require more in the sacrament of the Eucharist ? Instead of the Son of God under the appearance of man, we behold him under the semblance of bread and wine, and we have his own word in attestation of the fact.

those who heard him ; instead of ceasing to tempt their faith by what he had no intention of forcing upon it ; he only confirms his own assertion, and their interpretation of it : *Except, he replied, you eat of the flesh of the son of man, and drink of his blood, you shall not have life in you.* His disciples, like the members of the Established Church, were still obdurate, and, like them, they exclaimed : *This*

If the second person of the blessed Trinity, united with the nature of man, but veiling his divinity under the form of an infant, had been presented in common with a hundred other infants before any indifferent person, would it have been possible to distinguish him from the rest ? Why then should we look for any peculiar distinction in a consecrated host, over one that is not so ? If the son of God could appear amongst men as an infant child, preserving his divinity without altering the ordinary appearances of human nature ; why can he not equally veil his divinity under the appearance of bread, without changing the appearance of that bread to the visual faculties of man ? And why can he not also delegate the power to do so to his minister,—he who gave power to the rod of Aaron to convert the waters of the Nile into blood, and that blood into water again,—he who was able, by one single word, to call a whole world from nothingness ?

The remark of Tertullian, that he believed in Transubstantiation because it was impossible to have been the offspring of the human mind, is worthy of observation. He did not disbelieve and reject it, because it appeared extraordinary and inexplicable ! but feeling it impossible that it could have originated with man, he referred it entirely to God.

saying is hard, and who can hear it? But the doctrine of Jesus was fixed and immutable; and though *many went back and walked no more with him*, because of *this hard saying*, that *he would give them his flesh to eat*, yet his words were irrevocable; his decision was final. He never attempted to soften down his expressions, to adapt his meaning to the capacity of the senses, nor to measure his instructions by the understanding of man. At the same time that he conferred his favors, he wished to exercise our faith: he therefore left his doctrine as it was, and turning round to his Apostles, he asked; *If they also would leave him?* Was it possible to give a more striking proof that they had rightly understood him, and that his words were to be received in the plain and literal sense in which they had been taken by those who had left him disbelieving, and by those who, like Peter, remained *and believed?* If they had not rightly understood him, if they had left him with any material misconception of his meaning, would not he, who was the good shepherd, ready to lay down his life for his sheep, and whose sole desire was to gather all mankind into one fold, would not he have called them back, and by a seasonable explanation, have relieved them from their errors? The only rational, the only possible method of explaining this conduct of our Saviour is, by *subjecting our understanding to the obedience of faith*, and exclaiming in the words of St. Peter: "Lord, thou

hast the words of eternal life : we believe and have known that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." It is probable, however, that at this time, neither party precisely understood the *manner* in which Christ was to give his body and blood for the spiritual food of mankind. But the conduct of our Saviour, and the declaration of St. Peter, both point out the implicit obedience which we owe to the words of Christ, whether we understand them or not. Had our Saviour been explaining the mystery of the Trinity, or any other of the mysterious doctrines of Christianity, which no human capacity can possibly fathom and comprehend, we may well imagine that the conduct of Christ, the exclamation of St. Peter, and perhaps the incredulity of the Jews, would have been precisely the same.

But to terminate the explanation of this wonderful mystery—to manifest the completion of this august sacrament—and to exhibit the fulfilment of the promise he had made of giving himself as *the bread of life*,—our Saviour, at his last supper, *took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to his disciples, and said : Take ye, and eat, THIS IS MY BODY ;*^(o) *and taking the chalice also, he gave*

^(o) An Almighty God has said it: And man, vain man, has presumed to question it.—*O man! who art thou that repliest against God?* Rom. ix. 20.

thanks, and gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this; FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD, &c.^(p) Christ did not say, *here* is my body, *here* is my blood! which might have appeared to countenance the doctrine of Consubstantiation; but he says, *this* is my body: this is no longer bread, but the body of him who addresses you; the life-giving flesh of the Son of God: this is no longer wine, but the sacred fountain of life, that blood which shall so soon be shed upon the cross for the remission of your sins.

If any other testimony were required, the manner

^(p) A flimsy quibble is frequently resorted to for the purpose of destroying the force of these expressions; namely, that all that was required of us by these injunctions of Christ, was a mere *commemoration* of the last supper—*Do this in commemoration of me.* But it is at once overturned by the simple question; What was the important *this* that was to be done? Were the disciples to do what our Saviour had just done, or something else that was left to their own fancy?—On one occasion Luther says: “The devil seems to have mocked mankind in proposing to them a heresy so ridiculous and contrary to Scripture as is that of the Zuinglians, namely, the denial of the real presence.” (*Op. Luth. Defens. Verb. Con.*) In another place he acknowledges that he had tried to persuade himself of there being no real presence of Christ in the sacrament, on purpose to irritate and offend the Pope; but that the words of Scripture were too plainly in favour of it.—See *Letters to a Preb. p. 154.*)

in which St. Paul bears witness to this doctrine is a striking confirmation of it. *The chalice of benediction, which we bless, says he, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?*^(q) *And whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.*^(r) In receiving the bread, how can we be *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, if his body and blood be not there? How can we *eat and drink judgment to ourselves, not discerning the body of the Lord*,^(s) if the body of the Lord be not there to be discerned.^(t) An omniscient God foresaw the incre-

^(q) 1 Cor. x. 16.

^(r) 1 Cor. xi. 27.

^(s) Ibid. 22.

^(t) While St. Paul says that the unworthy communicant *is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, the doctrine of the Establishment renders the profanation of the sacrament an impossibility. I presume—and after all it is only a presumption, though I doubt whether any Protestant will contradict me—that the Church of England denies the real presence *in toto*: and this being the case, what is there in the sacrament for the unworthy communicant to profane? Where is the body and blood of the Lord, of which he is to be guilty? But, supposing, according to the words of the 28th Article, an act of faith really gives the body and blood of Christ to the communicant, who but a madman will make that act of faith, when he receives the sacrament unworthily and unpre-

dulity of mankind, and in mercy to those who are willing to believe, afforded evidence without end to preserve them from error upon this most important point. All the Evangelists, all the inspired writers, all the Fathers of the Church, concur in opinion upon this doctrine. There is no tenet for which there are so many vouchers; there is no mystery so distinctly revealed and so clearly defined.

If Transubstantiation were a modern doctrine, a doctrine of human invention, why cannot those who assert it to be so, prove both the manner and the period of so extraordinary an innovation in the faith of Christianity? If, in our own times, a minister of the Church of England were to ascend the pulpit, hold up to the people the consecrated elements, and exclaim, '*This is the body and blood of Christ:*' what astonishment would not fill the minds of his audience; what an outcry would there not be raised throughout the country! And

pared? How can he be guilty of *the body and blood of the Lord*, when, making no act of faith, he receives nothing but bread and wine? In one case, there is a certainty that it cannot, in the other there is a moral impossibility that the sacrament can, be profaned by an unworthy communicant who is a member of the Established Church. Hence the denunciation of St. Paul becomes void and unmeaning.

is it to be believed, that, if a similar occurrence, under similar circumstances, had taken place during the first ages of the Church, the effect would not have been the same? Would it have been so completely overlooked both by history and tradition? That such an assertion, under such circumstances, should have met with success, is a monstrous supposition, because, independent of its contradiction to our senses, it is a doctrine which has nothing but the authority of revelation to recommend it; for, unlike every false tenet, it neither flatters our passions nor our pride: that under such circumstances it should have been eagerly embraced, and universally adopted, would have required no less than the interposition of a miracle. But it did not originate in such circumstances; it rested not upon the authority of man; it was a doctrine not confined to a particular period, or a particular country: it was coeval and coextensive with Christianity itself.^(u) Of this doctrine abun-

^(u) Transubstantiation is equally the doctrine of the Greek church, and of all the Eastern churches that have separated themselves from the communion of the see of Rome; and as this separation took place, in some instances, as early as the fifth century, even *they* can bear testimony of its existence for 1400 years. The Lutherans, also, believe in the real presence. "I clearly saw," says Luther, "how much I should thereby [by disproving the

dant evidence has descended to us ; whoever, there-

doctrine of the real presence] injure Popery ; but I found myself caught without any way of escaping, for the text of the gospel was too plain for this purpose." (*Epist. ad Argenten.* tom. iv. fol. 502. Ed. Witten.) In another place he says, "That no one among the fathers, numerous as they are, should have spoken of the Eucharist as these men do [the opposers of the real presence], is truly astonishing. Not one of them speaks thus: *There is only bread and wine ; or, the body and blood of Christ are not present.* And when we reflect how often the subject is treated by them, it ceases to be credible—it is not even possible—that not so much as once such words as these should not have dropped from some of them. Surely, it was of moment that men should not be drawn into error. Still, they all speak with a precision which evinces that they entertained no doubt of the presence of the body and blood. Had not this been their conviction, can it be imagined that, among so many, the negative opinion should not have been uttered on a single occasion. On other points this was not the case. But our Sacramentarians, on the other hand, can proclaim only the negative or contrary opinion. These men then, to say all in one word, have drawn their notions neither from the Scriptures nor the Fathers." (*Defensio Verborum Cænæ*, T. vii. p. 391. Edit. Witt. 1557.) Again he says: "This I cannot, nor am I willing, to deny, that had any one, five years ago, been able to persuade me that in the Sacrament were only bread and wine, he would have laid me under great obligations to him ;...for I was clearly sensible that nothing would give so much pain to the Roman Bishop." *Ibid.* p. 502

fore, will take the trouble of investigating the subject, will find ample proof of these positions.^(*)

We are all well acquainted with the heresies of Montanus and Tatian in the 2nd, of Tertullian and Origen in the 3rd, and of Arius in the 4th century, and so on; and shall it be said that the tenets of Catholicity alone are without evidence and proof; and that while the errors of every petty sect, and even sometimes of individual writers, were carefully detailed in history and transmitted to posterity, the faith and practice of the Universal Church alone were left unnoticed and unattested? Let any one peruse the passages in St. Ignatius, St. Justin, St. Irenæus, &c. &c. in proof of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, during

(*) Let not the reader be deterred from this examination, under the idea that he has neither the capacity nor the leisure to explore the voluminous writings of the early Fathers of the church. He will find every passage of moment which bears upon this, or any other Catholic tenet, selected, translated, and arranged to his hands, in an admirable and most useful compilation of scriptural and historical testimony, in a single volume, entitled: "The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the five first Centuries of the Church;" by the Rev. Jos. Berington and the Rev. J. Kirk. Should any doubt arise as to the authenticity of any extract, or the fidelity of its translation, the reference at the end of every passage will afford a ready clue to the original.

the 1st, 2nd, and subsequent centuries of the Christian æra, and then determine whether it be the doctrine of primitive Christianity, or the comparatively modern innovation of the dark ages.

Under such a view of the subject, and with such evidence before us, is it possible we can swear that we believe the doctrine of the Eucharist in the sense in which it is commonly understood by English Protestants?

III. In the third place, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because she calls upon me *solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, to profess, testify, and declare*—not simply that I disbelieve in the Invocation of Saints,—but that *I do believe that the Invocation of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, as now used in the Church of Rome, is superstitious and idolatrous.* Whereas, I do solemnly and sincerely declare, and am ready to call God to witness the same, that I believe, in accordance to the decrees of the Council of Trent, that the doctrine *received from the earliest ages of the Christian religion*, has been that *the Saints, reigning with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men; that it is good and profitable suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their supplications and assistance, in order to obtain favours from God, through his Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.*

The texts of Scripture which tend to prove this doctrine are as follow. The angel Raphael says to Tobias: *When thou didst pray, with tears, and didst bury the dead, I offered up thy prayer to the Lord.*^(y) Judas Machabeus relates a vision, in which he saw the late high-priest Oniah, whom he describes as he appeared to him—stretching out his arms, and praying for the Jewish people. He then mentions another personage whom he saw, of whom Oniah says: *This is the lover of the brethren and of the people of Israel. This is Jeremiah the prophet of God, who prays for the people, and for the holy city.*^(z)—*I say to you, that even so there shall be joy in Heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance.*—*So I say to you, there shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance.*^(a)—*And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four-and-twenty ancients fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials, full of odours, which are the prayers of Saints.*^(b) From all this we argue the intimate communication between the saints in Heaven, and mankind upon earth; the efficacy of their

^(y) Tobias, xii. 12.

^(z) Machab. xv. 12. 13.

^(a) St. Luke xv. 7. 10.

^(b) Apocal. v. 8.

prayers ; and the interest they take in our behalf. Since St. Paul besought the Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians to pray for him, is it not clear that it is lawful for us to do the same ? and may we not do so, without detracting from the only mediator between God and man ? The practice of Protestants in praying for the king, &c. proves their assent to this position. And, if we may solicit the prayers of our fellow-men, who are mortals and sinners like ourselves, much more should we invoke those of the peculiar friends and companions of God, the adorers around the throne of grace and mercy ; and whom we know, from the texts above quoted, to be informed of what is passing upon earth ; to be eminently qualified for the task, and in the constant habit of performing it. All we beg of them is to intercede with the Mediator, through whom alone we hope for mercy, grace, and salvation, or for any favour that we may ask for at the hands of his saints.^(c)

^(c) The doctrine of the Invocation of Saints is so ancient and so universal, that the Greek church, together with all the eastern churches which separated themselves in the earlier periods of christianity from the church of Rome, still maintain it. Luther, so far from finding any thing idolatrous or superstitious in the doctrine or practice of the church in this point, exclaims : “ Who can deny that God works great miracles at the tombs of the saints ! I therefore, with the whole Catholic church,

Since there is not one single text of Scripture that can, in any way, be taken to contradict this doctrine, it is impossible it can be contrary to Scripture; and the convincing fact, that such has always been the view taken of it, and such the constant practice of the Catholic Church, is to be gathered from the works of the earliest ecclesiastical writers; copious extracts from which, relative to this point, are to be found in the work mentioned below.^(d) To this the reader is referred, as

hold that the saints are to be honoured and invoked by us.”* Such also was the opinion of many of the prelates of the Church of England.† Bishop Montagne, especially, says: “The blessed in heaven do recommend to God, in their prayers, their kindred, friends, and acquaintance on earth.”‡—“This is the common voice, with the general concurrence, without contradiction, of reverend and learned antiquity, for aught I ever could read or understand; and I see no cause or reason to dissent from them touching intercession in this kind.”§ Is it then safe for Protestants to swear that Catholics are superstitious for holding such a doctrine?

^(d) *The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the five first Centuries of the Church.* Booker, London, 1813.

* *In purg. quoramd. Artic. Tom. i. Germet. Ep. ad Georg. Spalat.*

† See Duchess of York’s Testimony, in the Duke of Brunswick’s *Fifty Reasons*, Burnet’s *Hist. &c.*

‡ *Antidote*, p. 20.

§ *Ibid.* p. 23.

these testimonies are far too numerous for insertion here.

The charge of idolatry brought against us for honouring those whom God has honoured, but especially for invoking the intercession of the Mother of God, the Queen of Angels, and the Saint of Saints, she who tells us, in an inspired Canticle, that *all generations shall call her Blessed*,^(e) and who was addressed by this appellation by the prophetic Elizabeth;^(f) who was hailed by the angel as *full of grace*,^(g) and to whom the Saviour and Maker of the world was obedient, as a child is obedient to its parent,—is too absurd to obtain a moment's credit with an unprejudiced mind. So far are we from the 'abomination of idolatry,' in the invocation of Saints, that the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, published in virtue of its decree, by order of Pius Vth, teaches that "God and the Saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner; for we pray to God that *he himself would give us good things, and deliver us from evil things*; but we beg of the Saints, because they are pleasing to God, that they *would be our advocates, and obtain from God what we stand in need of*."^(h)

(e) St. Luke c. i. 48. (f) Ibid. v. 42. (g) Ibid. v. 28.

(h) If it should be observed, that prayers are *occasionally* addressed to the saints in a manner which *appears* at first sight to dispense with the mediatorship of Christ, or

Our elementary Catechism in English says : “ we are to honour Saints and Angels as God’s especial friends and servants, but not with the honour which belongs to God.” Thus, when it is recollected that the reverence paid to the Saints is due to them only through the merits of our Saviour, it cannot be deemed any dishonour to the Creator to see his creatures honoured for the gifts he himself has bestowed upon them; nor will it be considered unbecoming the weakness and the misery of man, to offer our petitions to the throne of mercy through less unworthy hands than our own;—to make friends for ourselves amongst the friends of God;—and to implore the intercession of those in our behalf, who had already succeeded so well for themselves.

As an additional proof of the efficacy of the

to ascribe a power to them which they do not possess, it must be remembered that “ by a species of metonymy, we frequently employ the subordinate for the principal agent, and attribute to the intercessor what we know is the office of his superior. Let us suppose a criminal under sentence of death, who solicits the queen to obtain his pardon from the king. Were he in his petition to beg of her majesty *to save his life*, would any one contend that he had ascribed to the queen the power which the constitution has entrusted to the sovereign alone; and on that account indict him for treason, or a contempt of the king’s prerogative?” (Dr. Lingard’s *Tracts*.)

merits and prayers of the Saints, suffice it, amongst others, to mention two recorded in Holy Writ:—*I will bless thee, and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's SAKE.*⁽ⁱ⁾—*For thy servant David's SAKE, turn not away the face of thine anointed.*^(k) Do not these texts clearly show that, in consideration of the zeal and fidelity of his departed servants, God may sometimes be induced to grant particular blessings and favours to the living? And this too without any derogation from the merits and mediatorship of Christ, because whatever grace the Saints may possess in the eyes of God, it is wholly founded on the merits of our Saviour.

To understand the question rightly, and to explain that text of St. Paul, which says; *There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,*^(l) it must be observed that Catholics acknowledge Christ to be the *only mediator of salvation*; but it cannot be argued from thence that there is no other *mediator of intercession*, without condemning the conduct of St. Paul, the commands of Almighty God himself, and the practice of the Established Church. If, therefore, it is not derogatory from the mediatorship of Christ to solicit the prayers of each other, while here on earth, how should it be so in any other state of existence?

⁽ⁱ⁾ *Gen.* xxvi. 24.

^(k) *Psl.* cxxxii. 10.

^(l) 1 *Eph. Tim.* ii. 5.

^(m) See Dr. Lingard's *Tracts*.

And if the efficacy of prayer be such in behalf of each other, while in this mortal state, in which *no man stands justified in the sight of his Creator*,⁽ⁿ⁾ how much more may not be expected from it, when the just man is not only removed from this imperfect state of existence, but has received *power over the nations* ;^(o) is seated upon the same throne with the Almighty ;^(p) and is become *a pillar in the temple of his God*,^(q) in that temple where *the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascends up before God*.^(r) Where, then, I would ask, is the superstition and idolatry of all this ?^(s)

(n) *Psl.* cxlii.

(o) *Apoc.* ii. 26.

(p) *Ibid.* iii. 21.

(q) *Ibid.* iii. 12.

(r) *Ibid.* viii. 4.

(s) I will subjoin the opinion of Luther upon this point, though rather as an object of curiosity, than for the purpose of founding any argument upon it.

“ Concerning the Invocation of Saints,” says he, “ I agree with the whole Christian Church, and am of opinion, that the saints in heaven are to be invoked ; for, who can contradict the wonders daily wrought at their tombs ?” (*In Purg. Quorund. Artic. Tom. 1.*)—Again : “ Some, however, may say ; Of what use can the saints be to us ? Thou art to use them as thou dost thy neighbour ; for as thou sayest to him ; Pray to God for me ; so mayest thou, St. Peter pray for me.” (*In Festo St. Johannis Baptistæ.*) And in another place : “ Let no one omit to invoke the blessed Virgin, and the Angels and Saints, that they may intercede with God for them at that instant [the hour of death].” *Luther's Prep. ad Mort.*

Though *relics and images* are not expressly mentioned in the oath, yet, as we are not sure that they may not by implication be comprised therein, and that the charge of superstition and idolatry may not be grounded in the minds of those who take this test, upon the supposed doctrine and practice of Catholics upon these points, I deem it quite necessary for our justification to state our belief thereon. This belief may be found in the following propositions:—"God alone is the object of our *worship* and *adoration*, but Catholics shew *honour* to the relics of saints, and they place images and pictures in their churches, to reduce their wandering thoughts, and to enliven their memories towards heavenly things. They shew, besides, a *respect* to the representations of Christ, of the mysterious facts of their religion, and of the saints of God, beyond what is due to any profane figure; not that they believe any *virtue* to reside in them, for which they ought to be honoured, but because the honour given to pictures is referred to the *prototype*, or thing represented.

"They maintain also that honour and respect are due to the *bible*, to the *cross*, to the name of *Jesus*, to *churches*, &c. as things peculiarly appertaining to God; as well as to *kings*, *magistrates*, and *superiors*: for to whom honour is due, honour may be given, without any derogation from the majesty of God, or that divine worship which is appropriate to him."

To any one at all read in sacred history, it must be superfluous to produce texts of scripture to shew the wonderful miracles wrought by Almighty God by means of the relics of his saints :—When Eliseus smote the waters of Jordan with the mantle of Elias, they parted, and the prophet passed over ;^(t)—When a dead man was let down into the sepulchre of Eliseus, no sooner did he touch the bones of the prophet, than he revived and stood upon his feet.^(u) Numbers were healed merely by the shadow of St. Peter passing over them ;^(v) and others by handkerchiefs which had touched the body of St. Paul.^(y) Surely it is lawful to venerate the instruments which the Almighty has sometimes been pleased to employ in the performance of his wonderful works ; and from time immemorial it has been the custom, when a church was not actually built over the tombs of martyrs, to furnish it with the relics of saints, placing them immediately under the altar, that their mortal remains might occupy a similar situation upon earth, in which their souls were seen by St. John in heaven : *I saw under the altar, says he, the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held.*^(z)

^(t) 4 Kings, ii. 14.

^(u) *Ibid.* xiii. 21.

^(v) Acts, v. 14, 15, 16.

^(y) *Ibid.* xix. 11, 12.

^(z) Rev. vi. 9.

Having shewn that we are not superstitious in our veneration of relics, I trust also to prove that we are not idolators in our respect for images, and in the manner in which we use them. The answer in our English Catechisms to the question, *Do Catholics pray to images?* is this: *No, by no means, for they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us.* A similar answer, together with the most pointed condemnation of every species of Idolatry, is to be found, without one exception, in all the catechisms in use in Italy, France, Spain, Flanders, Germany; in a word, in every portion of the Catholic world, in every language in which Christianity is preached, and in every clime in which the name of Jesus is known. Now, if we consider the diligence with which the Catholic clergy inculcate the study of the catechism, the earnestness with which they impress it on the minds of children—the clear and familiar manner in which they explain it—and the assiduity and frequency of these explanations, we ought at least to hesitate before we pronounce that those who receive and believe these doctrines, receive and believe them in one sense, and practice them in another. It should also be observed that the clergy are no ways interested in keeping up any delusion upon this point; while the common instinct of man, every principle both of natural and revealed religion, conspire to direct his adoration to the sole

object worthy of it—to the great Creator and Disposer of all things. If, with all the checks and precautions employed, some abuse or extravagance should partially and occasionally exist, it must in justice be attributed rather to the perversity of human nature, than to any thing radically vicious in the system.

When the Almighty commanded cherubim,^(a) who are his creatures as much as man, to be made for the ornament of the ark of the covenant, he did so without fear that the Israelites, prone as they were to idolatry, would transfer those divine honours to them which they owed to himself alone. Indeed, when the Jewish people fell into this most abominable of all crimes, the idolatry was generally meditated first, and the idol raised afterwards: so far were they from being led astray by the use of images in their worship! Yet, be it remembered, that, though we are bound to pay a due respect to the images of Christ and of his Saints, when used,

^(a) Upon the Propitiatory stood two Cherubim, face to face, with their wings expanded and spread, so as to cover the Ark, forming, as it were, a throne for the God of all Sanctity and Majesty. Hence comes the expression often met with in the Sacred Writings, of God *sitting upon the Cherubim*. It is in imitation of this, that Cherubim are not unfrequently placed to ornament the altar of the blessed Sacrament, where the Almighty deigns to be visibly present.

we are not bound to use them. They are not necessary appendages to our service, and may be dispensed with, when it is judged proper. Except the Crucifix, an image is hardly ever seen in our Chapels in England, for fear of giving scandal to our Protestant brethren: in this we act in conformity to the advice of St. Paul, who recommends conceding to the weaknesses of others, when concession is no sacrifice of our duty. The Clergy of Catholic countries are the best judges how far the use of images is liable to be abused, and whether any mischief arises from the toleration of them; and, as they are not condemned, where there can be no sinister motive for continuing them, it is but charity to suppose, that they are not worthy of condemnation.^(b) In

(b) That it is in itself no impiety to pay religious veneration to inanimate objects, is to be deduced from the commands of Almighty God himself, in the Old Testament. Moses was ordered to put off his shoes on Mount Horeb, and walk barefoot, because it was *holy ground*. The Israelites were, in several instances, commanded to show a high respect to the Ark of the Covenant, and severe punishments were inflicted upon those who either touched it, or looked upon it with irreverence or inattention. In the New Testament we are commanded to bend the knee at the name of Jesus; and why may we not pay the same mark of respect to the representation of his sufferings, without the imputation of Idolatry? By both we only honour the Redeemer of Mankind.

England we pray to Saints, without their images before us, and we invoke the assistance of the Mother of God, without the aid of a picture to enliven our devotion. Protestants take off their hats out of respect before a sinful man; they pay homage to the portrait of their sovereign, in the halls of his ambassadors, and to the empty throne in the house of peers; they rise from their seats, and stand uncovered, during the performance of music in honour of the King; they bow the head when the name of Jesus is pronounced; they kiss the Bible when they have sworn by it, they decorate their Churches with images painted upon glass; they even kneel before their consecrated bread and wine; “mere bodily elements, of earthly manufacture;” ^(c)—and all this without incurring the charge of idolatry. But why similar marks of respect and veneration may not be shown to the image of the Mother of God, or of the Prince of the Apostles, without subjecting those who show them to the odious imputation of superstition and idolatry, is only conceivable to the minds of men who come forward with so groundless and uncharitable a charge. It evinces a degree of ignorance and credulity, equalled only by the want of charity which it betrays. Those who see with a superficial eye, and without a due knowledge of the circum-

^(c) Bishop of Durham's *Charge*.

stances, may doubtless be scandalized. The Jews were so even in regard to our Saviour, whom, in the ignorance or the blindness of their hearts, they called a drinker of wine, and the companion of publicans. Idolatry is an act of the mind, and not of the body: and it is a crying injustice to presume that a Catholic is praying *to* an image, because he is praying *before* it.^(d)

(d) Speaking of the conduct of the people towards a supposed miraculous image in the Pantheon, in 1817, Mr. Hobhouse, in his learned researches into the Antiquities of Rome, observes:—

“The veneration for a miraculous image which has lately crowded the Rotunda, has not bettered the condition of the pavement; nor does it help the general effect of the interior prospect, to be aware that we see exactly the same *idolatry* which was practised in the same spot sixteen centuries ago. A philosopher may smile, but a less indifferent spectator is shocked at the inexplicable credulity which stares in the stedfast faces of a hundred worshippers, seated in chairs for hours before the image, in the wish—the hope—the certainty—of some indication of omnipotence from the dirty cobweb-covered block which has been *preferred into divinity*.”

Now, leaving the *credulity* to be dealt with as it may deserve, I certainly must exonerate these individuals from the heavy charge of *idolatry* here brought against them. Had Mr. Hobhouse, whom I most sincerely admire as the steady and uncompromising advocate of civil and religious liberty, employed the same spirit of research in respect to

But such things are stumbling blocks to those only whose mind is darkened : that darkness may

the grounds of the religious tenets of the Romans, as he has done in support of his reasons for and against the identity of the various and interesting antiquities of their capital, it is impossible that his acute and penetrating mind, should not have discovered enough to have divested him of all predisposition to judge so hastily and so wrongfully of his neighbour, as he most assuredly has done in this instance : and had he, with this knowledge, applied himself to the particular case before him, I am quite satisfied, that he would have felt as convinced as I do, that no imputation of idolatry could be borne out. Whether any miracle was to be seen in the image is a different question, and depends solely upon the evidence of the senses ; but supposing that there was, that miracle was not attributed to the statue, but to the omnipotent power of Him who gave efficacy to the brazen serpent in the wilderness—to the shadow of St. Peter—to the handkerchiefs which had touched the body of St. Paul—and to numerous animate and *inanimate* objects, in every period of sacred history. No divine attribute was imagined to exist in the statue—no worship was paid to it—no efficacy was attributed to it : it was supposed, in all probability, by over-heated imaginations, that the Almighty had made use of it to express in a supernatural manner, either his displeasure or his satisfaction upon some particular occasion, or to add one more to the many miraculous attestations in favour of the religion of Rome. That Catholics are often predisposed to lend too easy a belief to miracles, is unquestionably the case : it arises from a firm,

proceed only from ignorance ; that ignorance from prejudice ; and that prejudice from the erroneous impressions of our youth : and however pardonable it may be in some cases, yet it becomes our bounden duty to dispel it by the light of reason, and by the more invigorated powers of the understanding. But it is always most unjust and uncharitable for men, with minds prepared for exaggerated impressions, to pass judgment upon questions on which they are quite incompetent to decide for want of information ; and still more so to publish those judgments to the world ; thereby inflaming the passions of men, and giving weight to that mass of prejudice which already exists in so lamentable a degree, in this country, against the most numerous, the most enlightened, but most calumniated body of Christians in the universe : and this, too,

unhesitating faith in the truth of their religion. Under this impression, they are necessarily more inclined to look for supernatural testimonials in its favour, and to receive them with but little investigation. This, however, is not the case when they undergo the scrutinizing test recommended by the Council of Trent, and which is resorted to on all occasions before a miracle is officially announced to have taken place.

It is by such means as these, that false impressions are produced upon the minds of the people of England, respecting *the religion of Ireland*, and the cause of religious liberty is unintentionally impeded.

when a little research would have exhibited these matters in their true light, and would have shown *that* to be a pious practice, agreeable both to reason and revelation, which is now first of all misrepresented, and then stigmatized as superstitious and idolatrous. It is surely beyond endurance that every thing should be calculated upon the impressions of prejudice ; and that, from the most liberal and most learned, as well as from the most bigotted and most ignorant, we should hear of nothing but the *absurdities* and *impositions* of the Catholic religion. Every doctrine, practice, and ceremony of our Church is too often seen through the same distorted medium ; but, happily for the cause of Christianity, to the eyes of the sincere inquirer, the darkness by which she is enveloped, is as quickly and as completely dispelled by the light of truth, as are the shadows of night before the dawning of the day.

to IV. From the idolatry of the Invocation of Saints, and the use of images, the oath now leads us to consider the grand accusation of idolatry against Catholics, as *the worshippers of bread and wine in the sacrifice of the Mass.* We are called upon “ solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, to profess, testify, and declare, that we *do believe* that the sacrifice of the Mass, as now used in the Church of Rome, is superstitious and idolatrous.” — Whereas, I do solemnly and sincerely

and am ready so to do with God for my witness, that I most firmly and steadfastly *believe* that the sacrifice of the Mass, as now used by the Church of Rome, was instituted by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as a perpetual commemoration of his death and passion; and that far from being either superstitious or idolatrous, it is a sacrifice of propitiation, most pleasing and acceptable to the Almighty, who absolutely requires it from the hands of his ministers. Independently of the authority of the Church, I believe it from the following view of the question, which I shall state in as cursory a manner as possible.

In almost the earliest periods of Sacred History, we read of the sacrifice of *bread and wine* offered by Melchisedec, the priest of the Most High; this, together with the feast of unleavened bread, was emblematical of the matter and form, while the chief sacrifice of the law of Moses, the Paschal Lamb, was a type of the essence and substance, of that great sacrifice which was once offered up upon the altar of the cross, and has been ever since perpetuated in the continual commemoration of that event, ordained by our Redeemer himself; a commemoration which so distinctly verifies the prophecy of Malachias, delivered so many years before. *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts,*^(e) addressing himself to the stiff-necked

(e) *Malac. i. 10.*

and reprobate Jews, *neither will I accept an offering at your hands. For, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering.*^(f) We see how this sacrifice was offered,

and in what manner its institution was understood, by the Apostles, immediately after the death and resurrection of our Saviour. *As they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting,* say the Acts of the Apostles, (xiii. 2,) *the Holy Ghost said to them, &c. — Again, The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?*^(g)

These, and many other texts of the inspired writings, point out the practice, and innumerable testimonials of the first ages of the Church mark the interpretation which it bore; and it has ever since continued, and ever will continue (for the word of God *shall not pass away*^(h)) a perpetual commemoration of that great peace-offering, in propitiation for the sins of mankind, the passion and death of our Saviour, and a striking and complete verification of the above pointed and remarkable prophecy, and without which no accomplishment of it is to be found. Though Protestants

^(f) *Malach. i. 10-11.*

^(g) *1 Cor. x. 16.*

^(h) *St. Luke, xxi. v. 33.*

have retained the symbols of bread and wine, and, in one sense, use them as a commemoration of the death of our Redeemer (though this but seldom), yet Catholics alone (the Greek and Eastern schismatics included, who believe in Transubstantiation as well as ourselves) cease not to offer them in the way of sacrifice. As sacrifice is a homage which we never pay but to God alone, so also is it an essential mark of that supreme and sovereign duty which we owe to the Omnipotent Author of the creation; and from the very first existence of man upon earth, it has ever formed a principal part of the worship which heaven required at his hands: and yet protestantism has abolished it.⁽ⁱ⁾

⁽ⁱ⁾ Cain and Abel offered to God the fruits of the earth and animals. *Gen.* iv. 3, 4.

Noah, also, when he quitted the ark, immediately erected an altar, and thereon offered to the Lord of all things, a holocaust of clean animals. *Gen.* viii. 20.

Under the old law there were three distinct species of sacrifice: 1st. *The Holocaust*, which was entirely consumed by fire, to signify the complete and unreserved homage due to the Sovereignty of Heaven; 2nd. *The Victim for sin*, which was always united to the Holocaust, and was divided into three parts; one being consumed upon the altar, the second burnt beyond the precincts of the camp, and the third eaten by the priests; 3d. *The propitiatory sacrifices*, offered either in thanksgiving to God for past favours, or to implore fresh blessings: of these not only the priests, but also the people, partook.

In the Temple of Jerusalem 32,000 Levites were appointed to serve therein, and the sacrifices were offered with music. Four lambs were offered for a holocaust; two in the morning, and two in the evening; and this was called the *Perpetual Sacrifice*. On sabbath days and festivals the sacrifices were multiplied.

Under the Christian dispensation, the Sacrifice of the Mass has succeeded to the Sacrifice of the Temple of Jerusalem; indeed the latter were emblematical of the former, which now constitutes that universal and perpetual *Clean Offering*, foretold in those very times.

Notwithstanding the ample manner in which this subject has been already treated, of such high importance do I feel it to be to justify ourselves in the eyes of our fellow christians from the very gross imputations heaped upon us, on the ground of our belief in Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass—imputations which go to class us with the idolators of China and Hindostan—that I will insert an able and learned argument from the pen of a late venerable prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, which will, I trust, be found to elucidate the points at issue.

“But if,” he says, “abstracting from the infallible authority of the Catholic Church, this question of fact, whether the Sacrifice of the Mass was instituted by Christ as the sacrifice of his body,

and blood, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, be made a matter of historical inquiry, the truth of it may be easily ascertained by the evidence of historical testimony. The establishment of Christianity in all countries was a great public fact. The establishment of Christianity consisted in the establishment of the belief and profession of the doctrines, and of the reception and observance of the precepts and institutions of Christ. Every Christian will surely give credit to the Apostles for having introduced into all countries, where they established Christianity, the very same doctrines, precepts, and institutions, that they had received from Christ himself. The Apostles could all say, what St. Paul said of himself, when he shewed the Corinthians what authority he had for instructing them in the doctrine of the Eucharist: ‘I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you.’ (1 *Cor.* xi. 23.)

“As there could be no contradiction or inconsistency in what they received from Christ, the Apostles must have uniformly delivered and established the *same* in all places. Hence, by ascertaining what religious doctrines and institutions were uniformly taught and established in all nations by the Apostles, or by Apostolic teachers instructed and sent by them, we come to the certain knowledge of the doctrines and institutions of Christ. What those were which were uniformly

delivered and established by the Apostles in all nations, where they established Christianity, may be shown by historical evidences, attesting what religious doctrines and sacred rites have constantly and uniformly been professed and observed through all ages from the beginning, by all Christian Churches founded by the Apostles, or by men deriving their mission from Apostolic authority. So that if, on inquiry, it be found that the same religious doctrines and ordinances have been uniformly professed and observed in all Christian countries, for eighteen, or at least were, for fifteen centuries, and that no later origin of the introduction of these doctrines and ordinances can be assigned, than the first establishment of Christianity in those countries, in some of which it was established by the Apostles themselves, surely this must be admitted as a most convincing proof that these doctrines and ordinances are the same as the Apostles delivered, and as they had received from Christ himself.

“ If at any period of the Jewish state proof had been called for, to show that the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb was instituted by the authority of God, on the eve of the passage of the Israelites out of Egypt, as a constant memorial of that miraculous event, and of the circumstances attending it, would not the historical evidence of the annual oblation of the Paschal sacrifice in the Jewish church, the un-

interrupted observance of which rite might be traced back to the time of Moses, serve as an authentic and undeniable testimony of the origin and ends of its institution. If it were required to show that the sacrament of baptism was instituted by Christ, for the remission of sin, and for the other spiritual effects which it is believed to produce; most undoubtedly the uniform and universal practice observed in all Christian churches, in all countries, and in all ages, from the first establishment of Christianity in those countries, of administering baptism as a sacred rite ordained by Christ for those spiritual effects, would be admitted as a strong and legitimate proof, that this sacrament originated in the institution and command of Christ himself. And this ancient and universal practice of all Christian churches, would have the force of an authentic decision of the true meaning of the words of Christ, related in Scripture, concerning the necessity of baptism, by water, for the remission of sin. Could the origin or meaning of any civil law be better shewn, than by the uniform practice of the judges and magistrates in enforcing the observance of it, from the period at which it is supposed to have been made?

“ If, therefore, it can be historically shewn, that the sacrifice of the Mass, as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, had been con-

stantly and universally offered in all Christian churches, in all countries, and in all ages, from the first establishment of Christianity in those countries, to the time of Luther in the sixteenth century; it will be established as an historical fact, that the Sacrifice of the Mass was introduced by the apostles into all countries where they established Christianity, and consequently that it was received by them from Christ, no less than the Sacrament of Baptism, or any other doctrine or institution of the Christian religion. This can be shewn by the evidence of historical testimony.

“ It is an historical fact, that when Luther first began to abolish the practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the year 1534, this sacrifice was then universally offered as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ really present under the appearances of bread and wine, by all Christian churches of every denomination in the world; not only by those which were in communion with the see of Rome, and which are spread more or less over all nations; but by those, which for many centuries had been separated from its communion; by the Greek schismatical church, and by all the various sects of the Nestorians, Eutychians, and other heretical churches spread over Asia and part of Africa. That the Sacrifice of the Mass was at that period offered in all churches throughout the world, which were in communion with the See of

Rome, will not be denied. That it was offered at that time, by the schismatical and heretical churches alluded to, will be shewn by proper testimonies. It has, indeed, been acknowledged by Protestant writers of the first respectability.

“ It is also an historical fact, that the constant and universal practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ really present under the appearances of bread and wine, may be so far traced back in all those Christian churches, in every country, from the sixteenth century to the earliest ages ; that no later origin can be assigned of this religious practice, than the first establishment of Christianity in those countries.

“ It may be observed that none of those schismatical or heretical churches mentioned above, had derived any religious doctrine or rite from the Church of Rome; since the period of their separation from the faith and communion of the Apostolic See; and, consequently, that the Christian doctrines or rites, which they held in the sixteenth century, in common with the Church of Rome, were held by both before the period of the separation. Hence the testimony of the Greek schismatical church, and of the other schismatical and heretical churches in Asia and Africa, concerning the antiquity and divine institution of the Sacrifice of the Mass, cannot be suspected as given in

favour of the Church of Rome, but must be admitted as strong evidence of fact.

“The attempts which were made by some Lutherans and Calvinists in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, to engage the Greek schismatics in the East to adopt the doctrines of the Reformation, and particularly to reject the Sacrifice of the Mass, drew from the Greek bishops the most solemn attestations of the practice of their churches, the most explicit professions of their ancient doctrines, and the most energetic condemnations of the innovations, both in doctrine and practice, introduced by the reformers of religion, in the sixteenth century. Relative to the Sacrifice of the Mass, the following declarations were made by the first ecclesiastical authorities of the different schismatical churches in the East.

“The Eutychian Patriarch of the Armenians published the doctrine and practice of the Eutychian churches, in a solemn act, dated Aleppo, May 1, 1668: ‘We adore,’ says he, ‘with supreme worship, Jesus Christ, who is hidden in the Holy Eucharist, and *we offer*, in the *Holy Sacrifice*, for the remission of the sins of the living and the dead, the same body which was crucified, and the same blood which was shed for us on Mount Calvary.’

“The Nestorian patriarch, Joseph, and his clergy, in a public attestation, given at Diarbec, in the

year 1669, thus express their condemnation of the doctrines falsely imputed to the Nestorian churches by the Calvinists, and also their profession of the doctrine held by those churches concerning the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass: ‘ We have learnt with extreme astonishment that a certain son of Satan, of the French nation (they speak of the minister Claude) has dared to offer an atrocious injury to the Oriental church, by falsely charging it with not believing, and not receiving, the great mystery of the sacred oblation. We firmly believe, that after the words of Jesus Christ, which the priest pronounces by the authority which he has received from heaven, the substance of bread is changed into the substance of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the substance of wine is changed into the substance of his precious blood, so that nothing remains of the bread and wine, but their accidents. We *offer* this holy body, which was crucified for us, and this blood, which was shed for many and for us; *i. e.* for the living and the dead, for the remission of their sins.’

“ Seven schismatical Greek archbishops, who were assembled at Constantinople, on the 18th July, 1671, attested the doctrine of their churches, by this solemn declaration: ‘ That the Eucharist is a *sacrifice* for the living and the dead, instituted by Jesus Christ, and delivered to us by the Apostles.’

“It is therefore an historical fact, that at the time of the Protestant reformation, by Luther and Calvin, not only the Greek schismatical church, but the heretical Churches in Asia and Africa, of which the Nestorians and Eutychians are the leading sects, admitted and offered the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine. From whom did they receive this doctrine and this sacred rite? Not from the Church of Rome, from which they had received no rite of religion, no tradition, no doctrine, since the distant period of their separation from its communion. The Mass was, therefore, admitted as the common Christian sacrifice, by the Greek schismatical Church before the year 890; by the Eutychians, before the year 451; and by the Nestorians, before 431: the periods of their separation from the communion of the Church of Rome. Indeed, we see that the seven Greek Archbishops cited above, declared; ‘That the Eucharist is a *sacrifice* for the living and the dead, *instituted by Jesus Christ, and delivered to us by the Apostles.*’ The doctrine of the Nestorians and Eutychians concerning the sacrifice of the Mass, which is the same on this point as the doctrine of all other ancient Christian churches, was not invented by Nestorius, nor by Eutyches, when they began to teach their heretical doctrines against other articles of the Christian creed; but this doctrine

of the sacrifice of the Mass, was the ancient doctrine of the churches in which Nestorius and Eutyches were originally instructed in the Christian Faith.

“ The above testimonies, which show what was the doctrine and practice in the sixteenth century of the Greek, and of all the Christian Churches of Asia and Africa, which are separated from the communion of the Apostolic see, and which show the high antiquity, even the divine origin, of that universal doctrine and practice of offering the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, cannot be suspected of partiality to the Church of Rome, but must be received as evidences of historical truth.

“ But when we consider the universality and primitive antiquity of the uniform doctrine and practice of all Christian Churches in communion with the see of Rome, concerning the sacrifice of the Mass, as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, what a collection of historical evidence is presented to us, demonstrating that this doctrine and practice was established by the Apostles, as the doctrine and institution of Christ, in all nations where they established Christianity? The most incontestible and irresistible proofs of this universal and primitive doctrine and practice,

are found in the ancient Liturgies, or Missals, or books containing the form and order of divine worship, used in all Christian Churches, from the beginning of Christianity.

The holy fathers of the Church agree that the substance of these Liturgies, which is the same in all, was derived from the Apostles, and communicated by them to the churches, where they preached and established the religion of Christ. The first Liturgy was that which was formed and used by the Apostles, in the Church of Jerusalem, and which is sometimes called the Liturgy of St. James, the first Bishop of that see; then the Liturgies of the patriarchate churches of Alexandria, called that of St. Mark, of Antioch, and of Constantinople. These Liturgies were communicated to the Churches under those Patriarchates. The most sacred part of these Liturgies, the Canon, was not originally written, but was carefully committed to memory by the Bishops and Priests, as the Apostles' Creed was by the faithful. The Canon was not committed to writing till the fifth age, when the danger of exposing all that was most sacred in the mysteries of religion, to the derision and blasphemy of infidels, was not so great as in the first three or four centuries. But when the Canon was generally committed to writing, it was found to be the same in substance in all Christian countries, which showed the unity of its origin, in the unity of that

faith which was every where taught by the Apostles. In all these ancient and primitive Liturgies, we find the clearest expressions and professions, made by priests and people, that the same body and blood of Christ, which were immolated on the cross, are offered to God in the Christian sacrifice, under the appearances of bread and wine, for the living and the dead ; and that this same body and blood are really received in the communion. In all these Liturgies, we read the most sublime hymns of praise and thanksgiving to God and Christ really present ; acts of spiritual communication between the faithful on earth and the saints in heaven ; and prayers offered for the repose of the souls of those who have departed this life in the faith and communion of the Church. Some short citations, from a few of the principal Liturgies, will show the spirit of them all. They all profess that the Mass is the *sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present, under the appearances of bread and wine.*

“ In the Liturgy of Jerusalem, after the form of the consecration of the bread and wine, the priest says, ‘ We *offer* to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody *sacrifice*.’ Before the Communion, the Priest, addressing his prayers to Jesus Christ, on the altar, says, ‘ O Lord, my God, may thy grace render me worthy to receive *thy sacred body* and *thy precious blood*, for the remission of my sins,

and for life everlasting.' In the Liturgy of Alexandria, which has been in use among the Cophtes or Eutychians for about 1300 years, the Mass is called the '*sacrifice of benediction.*' In the prayer of the oblation of the bread and wine, the Priest thus prays to Jesus Christ: '*Change them, so that this bread may become thy sacred body, and what is contained in the chalice, thy precious blood.*'

In the Liturgy of Constantinople, the Mass is called a "rational and unbloody *sacrifice.*" The Priest offers this prayer to Christ, 'O, Jesus Christ,—our God,—thou who dwellest in heaven with the Father, and who art here invisibly with us, make us worthy to partake of *thy most pure body, and of thy precious blood*, and to distribute it to thy people.

"In the Liturgy of the Syrians, it is called a '*propitiatory sacrifice.*' In the Syriac Liturgy, called of St. Maruthas, the priest prays, 'that this, which is mere bread, may be changed, and may become *the same body* that was immolated on the cross, the same body that was raised in glory, and did not see corruption; the body of the Word of God, of our Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.' The people say 'Amen.' And that 'the wine, which is in the chalice, may be changed, and may become *the same blood* that was poured forth on the summit of Golgotha; the same blood that flowed on the earth and purified it from sin;

the blood of the Lord himself, of the Word of God, of the Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and for life everlasting, to those who receive it.'

"In the Armenian Liturgy, the priest, praying for the dead, says; 'Be mindful, O Lord, and having pity, be propitious to the souls of those who have departed this life, and particularly to that soul for which we offer this holy *sacrifice*.' During the communion this canticle is sung: 'This bread is *the body of Christ*; this cup is *the blood of the new testament*. The hidden sacrament is manifested to us, and by it God shews himself to us. Here is Jesus Christ, the Word of God, who is seated at the right hand of the Father. He is *sacrificed* in the midst of us.'

"The Roman Liturgy was brought to England by St. Augustin in the year 595; and in substance has been the common Liturgy of all the Latin churches, from their conversion to Christianity. It agrees with our catholic Liturgy now in use, except in some accidental additions that have been made. In the Roman Liturgy, according to the sacramentary of Pope Gelasius, written about the year 490, we find these words before the consecration: 'We beseech thee, O Lord, in all things to bless, approve, ratify, sanction, and accept this oblation, that it may become *the body and blood of thy most beloved son*, our Lord Jesus Christ.'

And after the consecration the priest says; ‘ We offer unto thy supreme majesty, of thy gifts bestowed upon us, a pure *victim*, a holy *victim*, an unspotted *victim*, the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation.’

“ By the evidence of the ancient Liturgies, used by all Christian churches in the world, previous to the change of religion by Luther and Calvin in the sixteenth century, the uniform and universal religious practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, really present under the appearances of bread and wine, may be traced back to the earliest ages of Christianity. No later date can be assigned of the introduction of this sacred rite, than the period of the introduction of Christianity itself, into those countries in which the Sacrifice of the Mass was received. The primitive practice and the divine institution of Baptism by water, are not more strongly attested than the antiquity of the practice of offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the primitive belief that this holy sacrifice was instituted by Christ himself. The Sacrament of Baptism, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, are both proposed to our belief, by the same authority, as institutions of Christ; and both equally attested by the universal practice of all ages of the Christian church. Both, therefore, ought to be received with the same certainty of faith by every Christian.”

At the end of this volume^(a) will be found some of the authorities by which we deduce our doctrine upon these points, from the age of the Apostles, through the first five centuries of the Church, taken from that learned compilation, *The Faith of Catholics, confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries of the church;*” and which may be taken as a specimen of the testimony we can produce in favour of each individual article of our faith. The authorities from the fifth century to the present time, are so copious that it would be only a redundancy of proof to cite any of them; indeed it must be considered perfectly unnecessary so to do, since all Protestant writers agree that if the Catholic creed of the present day, can be proved to be conformable to that of the first four ages of the Church, the question of its authenticity must be considered as settled.

I trust that sufficient proof has now been offered in favour of the doctrine of Transubstantiation—of the real, undivided, and substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and in the Sacrifice of the Mass; and if Catholics are still to be accused of idolatry and superstition for their belief on these points, the accusation must, in the first place, be preferred against the Apostles themselves, and then be repeated against their descendants in the

^(a) See APPENDIX, No. 3, page xvi.

ministry through every succeeding age, implicating the great mass of the whole Christian world.

But, admitting for a moment, for the sake of argument, that the immense majority of Christians have, for upwards of 1,800 years, been labouring under an egregious mistake, to what does this charge of idolatry amount? That we believe Christ to be where, in the opinion of Protestants, he is not! 'This is the head and front of our offending.' Not that we adore any false or supposititious divinity, but that we worship the one only true and living God, the Creator of heaven, of earth, and of all things, truly and substantially present on our altars, though concealed under the sacramental veils of bread and wine; for it cannot be that we adore the *elements* of bread and wine, since the faith of Catholics is, that the elements no longer exist, but that they are totally and entirely changed into the body and blood, united with the soul and the divinity, of Christ. It is, therefore, only the true God whom we adore; and if we are mistaken, the adoration is equally directed to Him. The greatest possible extent of our error, therefore, can be in believing God to be visibly present where he is not so.^(b)

^(b) That colossus of literature, Dr. Johnson, speaking of the supposed idolatry of the Mass, is reported to have said: "Sir, there is no idolatry in the Mass; they [Ca-

With such principles of Christianity as we profess, and such a steadfast faith as we hold in the articles of our belief, it can no longer be a matter of astonishment that Catholics cannot conscienti-

tholics] believe God to be there, and they worship Him.”* But in thus enlisting him amongst the Protestant authorities in favour of many of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic church, I am fully aware to how little weight his opinions are entitled upon such subjects. Like all those who are not united in their creed by one common principle of obedience to revelation and authority, he was unsettled in his religious belief, and totally incompetent to pronounce upon such matters, from want of information, which, great as his acquirements were, in other respects, he had never taken the trouble to obtain in these. I chiefly cite him as an honourable example of liberality, and as above the vulgar short-sighted prejudices so common in the present day; and that too amongst persons who have enjoyed much better opportunities of divesting themselves of the errors of education, than he ever had. The same observations may, more or less, apply to all the other Protestant authorities, which, while they exhibit the vacillating nature of Protestant belief, serve also to prove how much more substantial it was in the days of her earliest and most learned divines, than are the shallow and unmeaning doctrines to which it has been reduced and explained away, by subsequent teachers in their church.

* See the whole Dialogue, which does great credit to Johnson's liberality.

ously swear that these doctrines of their Church, which we have just discussed, are either superstitious or idolatrous: and, I trust that enough has been said to show, that it ought to be the earnest desire of Christians of every denomination, to see so false and so odious a test wholly and entirely abolished. What, in the name of heaven, has the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Invocation of Saints, or the Sacrifice of the Mass, to do with the imposing or collecting of the public taxes (which, notwithstanding, Catholics pay the same as others), with the propriety of applying the sinking fund to the exigencies of the state—with the liberation of Greece—with the game laws—or indeed with the regulation of any part of our economy, either foreign or domestic? Though no encomium was thought fitting in the speech from the throne, the nation has been loud in its just and heartfelt praises on the heroes of the glorious and brilliant victory of Navarin:—and I will challenge even a Peel to say, if it has ever once flashed upon his mind, that the laurels so nobly won by admiral de Rigny, were less bright because that gallant officer believes in Transubstantiation, and in the spiritual supremacy of the Pope? That admiral Heiden's were blighted by the Invocation of Saints? or that sir Edward Codrington's were the more glorious, because, like a true Protestant, as we must suppose him to be, he looks upon these partners of his victory as idolators?

Away, then, with the folly and hypocrisy of those who would taint the merits of the valiant and the virtuous, because they believe in the purest and the oldest doctrines of Christianity, doctrines which we prove to have been revealed from heaven; but which a new and persecuting church has erroneously conceived it to be her policy to stigmatize as superstitious and idolatrous! If they *will* exclude Catholics from parliament, let them invent a Test for the purpose, which shall not be a libel on the memory of those ancestors, of whom Englishmen are so fond of boasting—that shall not be a gross insult upon one hundred millions of the people of Europe, and twenty millions of the people of America, all and without exception, the allies of this country,—a Test which, while it ceases to defame those who refuse it, will not risk to wound the consciences of those who take it.^(c)

^(c) I trust I have given the true construction of that part of the oath which calls upon us to declare that there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements, &c. *in the sense in which it is commonly understood by English Protestants.* I have taken these words to refer to that tenet of Protestantism, be it what it may, which has been substituted for that doctrine of the Catholic Church, of which Transubstantiation forms a distinctive feature. If the oath were meant as a mere condemnation or rejection of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, why did it not say so in plain, simple, and unequivocal terms? Why add, “in the sense in which they [the words of the oath] are

V. Let us now proceed to Other Reasons which must for ever prevent a Catholic from conscientiously

commonly understood by English Protestants," unless it were meant to pledge us to the belief of that which English Protestants commonly hold as an article of their faith? If I have mistaken the meaning of the oath, I trust it is from the want of perspicuity and precision in the oath itself. But surely this very circumstance is but another objection to it. We allow that the terms of an oath are not always to be canvassed, and cavilled at too minutely; but the sense in which the oath is taken must be *clearly* understood, and *by no means be contradicted by the oath itself*. There must be a perfect understanding between the parties as to its *real* meaning. Now, if it be contended that the oath in question, is so loose, vague, and indeterminate, that, its object being merely to exclude Catholics from parliament, it is not meant to bind the consciences of men in any other respect; we meet with difficulties at every point. In almost every part of it we find, not merely a negation of opinions, but an absolute and solemn asseveration of the truth of others, stated in plain and intelligible terms. Out of four distinct propositions of which the oath consists, there is but one that savours of any ambiguity; and this, I contend, does but make it the worse, unaccompanied as it is by any explanation. Such an evasion, as I have supposed, of the plain and positive terms in which it is couched, would only subject the individual who alleged it, to the guilt of a total disregard of the solemnity of an oath, and of calling the Almighty to bear witness to the truth of assertions, which, with the sacred volume in his hand, he was making with his lips, but from which his mind dissented.

tiously conforming to the Established Church, or to any other system of Protestantism. For, independently of what is demanded of us by the Test, being also called upon to conform to the establishment by the *Corporation Acts*, which require us to take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England; there likewise arises a necessity for stating our reasons more generally for non-conformity to that Church.

In the *First* place, then, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because, as the Scriptures do not contain *all* things whatsoever Christ commanded his Apostles to *teach*,^(d) Protestants are not authorized in holding them forth as our *only* rule of faith, our *only* teacher. We know that *there are also many other things which Jesus did* [and of course said]; *which, if they were written every one, the world itself would not be able to contain the books that should be written.*^(e) We know that St. Peter *testified with very many other words*^(f) than those which were committed to writing; and St. John also informs his disciples that, *having more things to write to them, he would not by paper and ink, for he hoped he should soon be with them, and speak face to face.*^(g)

There are numerous other instances in the sa-

^(d) *St. Matt.* xxviii. 19, 20. ^(e) *St. John* xxi. 25.

^(f) *Acts* ii. 40. ^(g) *2 St. John*, 12.

cred writings of similar declarations,^(h) yet with such a knowledge of the rich treasures which came from the lips of our Saviour and his Apostles, Protestants argue as if they considered that nothing more was worthy of preservation but what was recorded, at a considerable distance of time, in the New Testament. What reason have we to suppose, that the doctrines which we hold by Tradition, were not those which were preached by our Saviour, but omitted by the sacred penmen? Because the scriptures are silent, are we to conclude that Christ was so too? It is nowhere said, that they were written for the purpose of containing a regular code of faith: they were written to edify, instruct, and exhort—not to be a sole and independent guide in matters of doctrine; to confirm, rather than to define, our faith. There are clearly other sources of historical evidence than written documents. If it pleased our Saviour to inspire the writers of the New Testament, (and which we do not know to have been the case, from the scriptures themselves, save in regard to the Apocalypse, though, indeed, many parts may be said to bear internal evidence of the

(h) Christ *shewed himself alive after his passion, by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them* [his apostles and disciples] *and SPEAKING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.*
Acts i. 3.

hand of God,) so it has pleased him to guard uninjured and unbroken, by his particular providence, a chain of traditionary evidence. Is it not as easy for the Almighty, by a peculiar superintendence of his providence, to preserve the purity of his doctrine inviolate through the lapse of ages, as it was to inspire illiterate fishermen to preach that doctrine in the first instance? If Christ could inspire men to write and to preach, can he not equally inspire them, when sitting in judgment, relative to the verdict they are to pronounce? It is this superintendence of his Providence which has transmitted to us that part of his holy law which was not written, and which we reverence and obey equally with that which was, because they proceed from the same authority—the authority of God.

Though the Protestant Church rejects the doctrine of Tradition, yet, amongst her numberless inconsistencies, she grounds a part of her creed upon it; namely, the sanctification of the Sunday, the validity of infant baptism, and indeed, the ground-work of all her belief, the authenticity and inspiration of her sole, independent rule of faith, the canonical books of the New Testament.⁽ⁱ⁾ For

⁽ⁱ⁾ See *Strictures on Dr. Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome*, by Dr. Lingard. Booker, 1815.

it is traditionary evidence alone that can possibly prove, in most cases, the inspiration, and, in all parts, the authenticity and integrity of the Scriptures. In her xxixth article, the Church of England quotes St. Augustin for his opinion, and yet she rejects his evidence on other points. If he is worthy of belief in one case, the circumstances being the same, equal credit is due to him in others. But this she refuses, and not only to him, but to all who, like him, are the most fit to guide us in such inquiries, and to make us most intimately acquainted with the belief and doctrines of the Catholic Church, during the first ages of Christianity. It is not to be imagined with what reason, or justice, the evidence of such a constellation of the brightest luminaries of the Christian world, as the Fathers of the first ages of the Church, is refused? How is it possible that any deception can be practised, when we rely on the testimony of men the most virtuous and the most learned, of every age, and of every country, not only divided by distance of space, but by distance of time, yet all concurring in the same opinions; men who could have no object in deceiving, but whose only aim was the elucidation of truth, and the maintenance of the Christian religion in its native purity. They could have no object in deceiving; for, unlike the Reformers of the sixteenth century, they inculcated a just obedience to authority, instead of an emancipa-

tion from it. They preached penance and mortification, instead of laxity of morals and criminal indulgence. In rejecting tradition, a chain of evidence is denied, calculated most infallibly to establish any facts or any opinions to be drawn from the testimony of man; and such demonstrative proofs are refused, as we should be ashamed to disown for the establishment of a point of history, or a matter of inquiry in any other cause. We do not rely upon the Fathers as the infallible oracles of the word of God; we quote them only as proofs of the doctrines of the Church in their own times: in this light, their evidence is most conclusive and unexceptionable, and as such they form a most invaluable traditionary history.

We have, at the same time, Scripture evidence to prove, that it was ordained by Christ that much of his doctrine should be handed down to us by tradition. Tradition gives us the sense, at the same time that it proves the authenticity and inspiration, of the sacred writings; and as Catholics alone have existed in all ages, so Catholics alone have the tradition of all ages in their favour. St. Paul says, to the Corinthians; *Keep my ordinances as I delivered them to you.*^(*) to the Thessalonians; *Brethren stand fast, and hold the Traditions, which you have learned by word, or by our Epis-*

^(*) 1 Cor. xi. 2.

tle:^(l) to Timothy; *Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard from me in faith, and in the love, which is in Christ Jesus:*^(m) and again; *And the things, which thou hast heard of me before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also.*⁽ⁿ⁾

With such Scripture authority for tradition, surely we are justified in contending, that, if a doctrine was known to have prevailed in a district which had been converted to Christianity by the preaching of the Apostles, and if the same doctrine was prevalent in all other districts, under similar circumstances, that *that doctrine must have been derived from them, and is clearly an apostolical tradition*. Hence it formed an article of Catholic faith, as much as if it had been detailed in the Sacred Writings. Throughout the Holy Scriptures, there is constant mention of a command to *teach*, but never to write; preaching was the grand method of diffusing Christianity; writing was only an auxiliary and subordinate means. Christianity had been widely spread before any part of the New Testament was written, and, still more so, before it obtained any general circulation. Yet Protestants maintain, that what was written is *alone* to be attended to; that teaching and preaching are of no avail, unless that which was taught and preached

^(l) 2 *Thess.* ii. 14.

^(m) 2 *Tim.* i. 13.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *Ibid.* ii. 2.

was forthwith committed to writing : they argue as if St. Paul had said : “ Hold fast the doctrine which you have learnt by our Epistle ; but that which we have preached by word of mouth, heed it not.”

When our Saviour gave his final instructions to the Apostles, he thus addressed them : *Go ye, therefore, and TEACH all nations, baptizing, &c. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*^(o) *Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved ; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned.*^(p) “ This is his promise (says St. Jerome) ; he will be with his disciples to the end of the world : thus showing that they shall never die, and that he will never desert them that shall believe in him.”^(q) The Catholic Rule of Faith therefore is, and always has been, that we are bound steadfastly to believe that, which the Almighty having revealed, the Church has proposed to our belief. We hold that the Church is the sole depository of the revelations of heaven, and that she alone has authority to promulgate them upon earth : and, consequently, that the same truths have been

^(o) *Matt.* xxviii. 19. 20.

^(p) *Mark*, xvi. 15. 16.

^(q) *Comment. in Matt. L. iv. T. iii. p. 734.*

delivered down to us by the same channel, namely, by the *teaching* of the Apostles and their successors. We receive the doctrines of the successors of the Apostles, with the same credit as if we received them from the Apostles themselves. "The difference lies in this only;—that the interval between us and Jesus Christ, the fountain of every Christian truth, is measured by eighteen centuries; whereas, the communication between that fountain and the Apostles, and between these Apostles and the next to them in succession, was immediate. But truth is not lost, nor altered, nor weakened, by descent, when an unbroken chain of living witnesses, provided with all necessary documents, proclaims its identity; and the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit gives security to their words: *I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*"

I have preferred beginning with this point, rather than with the more systematical line of argument which follows, because it afforded me an opportunity of stating *the Rule of Faith* amongst Catholics, a rule which ought always to be borne in mind in every controversial discussion, and to which every article of our belief is deducible.

In the *Second* place, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because no Protestant church possesses any of those characteristic marks of the true Church, so clearly and incontrovertibly pointed out in the sacred writings, and attested as such

by the universal consent of Christendom—Protestantism is neither ONE,^(r) HOLY,^(s) CATHOLIC,^(t) nor APOSTOLICAL.^(u)

First,—No Protestant Church is *one*, because none of them have ever succeeded in preserving, even for a single moment, any unity of faith. ^(x) They began with variations, and have continued in a constant succession of variations ever since. All the Apostles of the Reformation differed in their creed and doctrines: the Church of England differs from them. The divines of the Church of England differ among themselves, and hardly any two members of any Protestant church agree in their belief; so that, being without unity of faith, they have not even, like the Greeks, the limited uniformity of a separate church.^(y) If Protestantism were true, Protestantism would be one, because truth is essentially one. The common rules by which the faculty of man is usually regulated, appear to be strangers to Protestantism. It would appear to be forgotten that opposite conclusions, drawn from the same authority, cannot both be true—that there cannot be many truths,

^(r) *St. John*, x. 16, and *Ephes.* iv. 3, 4, 5.

^(s) *Ephes.* v. 26, 27. ^(t) *Acts*, 1. 8. *Romans*, x. 17, 18.

^(u) *St. Matt.* xxviii. 19, 20. *Ephes.* iv. 11, 12, &c.

^(x) *Ephes.* iv. 12. ^(y) See Bossuet's *Histoire des Variations*, &c.

all in contradiction to each other. Truth disdains to be made subservient to circumstances; she scorns to be the sport of the passions, and of the pride of man; she is always uniform and consistent—always open and undisguised—always sublime and unchangeable, like the Deity, from which she emanates.

No Protestant church *can be one*, because, though Protestants acknowledge an authority to decide upon matters of faith, yet they lay no pretensions to infallibility;^(z) they have no infallible tribunal

(z) Our definition of the Church is the same as yours (*See the 20th of the Thirty-nine Articles*), but with this difference between us, that you will not acknowledge it as a guide, whereas we do. You claim for your church the same powers that we do for ours, namely, *authority in controversies of faith*; but then you will not *submit* to that authority.

“For what cause, or by what authority, do you condemn the Arian, the Socinian, or the Unitarian, because he understands those texts, and such others as prove the eternity and divinity of the Son of God, in a sense different from what you assign to them? Are the Socinians not men of sound judgment? Have they not, according to your rule, a right; nay, are they not obliged to follow, the dictate of that judgment, in preference to all authority on earth? and yet you exclude them from the kingdom of God, because in the exercise of their judgment, or in what you consider the discharge of their duty, they differ in

to appeal to, for the interpretation of those parts of scripture *which are hard to be understood, and which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction,*^(a) and, consequently, they have no right to establish a point of union, by which all Christians may become members of *one fold,*^(b) and believers in *one faith.*^(c) The Protestant churches, instead of being collected into *one fold,* under the superintendence of *one shepherd,*^(d) are split and divided into an endless variety of heresies and *schisms.*^(e) They are not *one body and one spirit.*^(f) They are neither *perfect in the same mind nor in*

opinion from yourself. Your opinion of them, if judged of by your own principles, is unjust, uncharitable, unreasonable; you have divested yourself of all right to repute any man a heretic, to censure any man for being a schismatic; you have erased heresy and schism from the catalogue of vices, and said with the false prophet, *Peace, peace,* when there was no peace."

You have established a system "which sanctions heresy and condemns it; which invites to schism and punishes it, which tells the believer to hear the church, and teaches him to prefer his own opinion, however monstrous and absurd, to her most solemn judgments. Why, a church thus constituted is incoherent and inconsistent; a hulk thrown upon the waters without helm or compass."

—*Reply to Dr. Magee by J. K. L.*, pp. 18, 62.

^(a) 2 St. Peter, iii. 16. ^(b) St. John, x. 16. ^(c) Ephes. iv. 4.

^(d) St. John, x. 16. ^(e) 1 Cor. i. 10. ^(f) Ephes. iv. 4.

the same judgment,^(g) nor careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.^(h) They are divided every where, and, as if a change of clime must naturally produce a change of doctrine, they vary wherever they are found. Thus, having no rule to direct him, and admitting his church to be liable to error, every Protestant immediately becomes his own Apostle. Every one follows the weak and fallible guidance of his own limited reason and capacity, which, creating an endless variety of opinions, and frequently of absurd contradictions, is wholly incapable of demonstrating the truth, or of conducting to a unity of faith.⁽ⁱ⁾ The consequence is, that religious dissension distracts the land; almost every family is at variance within itself: what God and Nature formed for harmony and concord, Religion, the lover of unity, and the promoter of peace, brings into strife and difference. Every year is ushered in with a new creed—every year, some new temple is erected for another false worship to the God of Truth. The wild reveries of a female impostor; the senseless ravings of an itinerant, self-inspired preacher; every crafty knave, or vain enthusiast, who throws the absurd and fantastic wanderings of his mind into the form of a religious belief, is sure to find

(g) 1 Cor. i. 10.

(h) Ephes. iv. 3.

(i) Ephes. iv. 13.

votaries amongst Protestants: they contrive to divide what has already undergone a thousand subdivisions; and if Protestantism shall last another century, we may expect to see, in this bewildered country, almost as many creeds as there are Christians.—Is there,—can there be unity in Protestantism? but is not unity the proud and exclusive attribute of Catholicity?

Secondly, The Protestant churches are not *holy*, because Luther, Calvin, Beza, and other inventors and propagators of Protestantism, instead of being pure apostolic men, and models of meekness, piety, and mortification, such as the ministers of the religion of Christ ought undoubtedly to be, who himself fasted, prayed, and forebore, to teach us to do the same, were directly the reverse. Far from imitating the lives of the primitive saints and apostles, whose doctrines they professed to preach, they everywhere established a greater laxity of morals, and, instead of reforming the wickedness of the times, only fostered and increased it.^(k) Nay, even the principal champion of Protestantism, does not hesitate to acknowledge in his own writings—as if to confound his followers, and open their eyes to his deceit—that he learned the principal tenet of

^(k) For an account of the increase of immorality, as a consequence of the Reformation in this country, see Dr. Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, Lett. 5th.

his new creed, not from the spirit of light and the God of Truth, but from the spirit of darkness and the Father of Lies,^(m) *giving heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of Devils,*⁽ⁿ⁾ and thus making himself a real object for the application of the words of St. Paul to Elymas: *O full of all guile and of all deceit, child of the Devil, enemy of all justice, thou ceasest not to pervert the right ways of the Lord.*^(o)

The Church of England is not *holy*, because it sprang from such unhallowed sources—because it originated in the lust of Henry VIII., was nurtured by the rapacity and profligacy of the ministers of Edward VI., and perfected by the ambition of Queen Elizabeth. Surely a religion which had so impure an origin, which was fostered in vice, “and which neither improves the piety nor the morals of the people, cannot pass for the work of God:” *by its fruits you shall know it.*^(p)

^(m) *St. John*, viii. 44. See an Account of Luther’s conversation with the devil, in *The Faith and Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, proved by the Testimony of the most learned Protestants*, &c. p. 54; by the Author of the *Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Church*. Dublin, 1813.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *1 Tim.* iv. 1.

^(o) *Acts* xiii. 10.

^(p) *St. Matt.* vii. 16. “Even the authors of the Reformation were themselves the first to mark its baneful effect upon the morals and piety of the people. ‘The world,’

Instead of endeavouring to bring our morality into a stricter conformity with the severe precepts of the gospel, and the maxims and the conduct of our Saviour, Protestantism has absolved its followers from many of those salutary restraints and mortifications, such as confession and fasting, which the religion of Christ had wisely imposed upon us for the subjugation of our passions, and as some slight atonement for our sins, through the merits of Christ.—*The evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit:—do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles?*^(q) Instead of encouraging the people to pay a daily public homage to their God in the house of prayer, the doors are closed against them;^(r) and, except on the Sunday, when, in-

says Luther, ‘grows every day worse and worse.—It is plain that men are much more covetous, malicious, and resentful; much more unruly, shameless, and full of vice, than they were in the time of Popery.’

^(q) *S. Matt.* vii. 16, 17.

^(r) The bishop of London, in his Charge for 1790, *p.* 11, observes: “Scarcely one symptom of religion ever appears amongst us, except on the Lord’s day.”—“It must be acknowledged,” says he, in another publication, “that the present remarkable thinness of our churches on Sundays, at the east as well as the west end of the town, is a proof that the neglect of divine worship is not confined to the great, but has pervaded almost every class of people in this capital.” *Sermons*, vol. I. *p.* 212.—Will not the same observations equally apply to the present day?

deed, no one who bears the name of Christian, would willingly absent himself from the service of his Creator, their altars are silent, and their churches empty. With what feelings would our Catholic ancestors, whose piety was proverbial, and whose daily practice it was to assemble in public adoration of that God who was their daily benefactor and protector, have looked upon the degeneracy of these days, upon the melancholy fruits of Protestant Reformation!

Whatever, to a superficial, and, perhaps, a prejudiced observer, may be the general appearance of immorality and irreligion, in Catholic countries, in our own times; and whatever may be the real degree of vice among the wealthy and the great, whose virtue, as is usually the case, is too generally *choaked up with the cares, the riches, and the pleasures of this life*; there is, at any rate, to be found, even in demoralized France, a large portion of sincere and unaffected piety. One can never enter a Catholic church, at any hour, even upon a week day, without being edified by the devout comportment of at least a few, and at the hour of morning service, of a great number of pious christians.^(*)

(*) "Even on week-days the churches are not deserted, pious Christians may be seen on their knees at all hours; and the ancient and affecting custom of the Catholic

The Protestant churches are not *holy*, because, among the ministers of their religion, no one has

church, so much recommended by Erasmus, is not yet forgotten or neglected, even in this profane capital." *Eustace's Letter to G. Petre, Esq.*—It is to be remarked that, since this period, religion has made immense progress in France, especially in the provinces.

The Catholic church is holy in her people, from the number of devout persons of both sexes, who, preferring the part of Mary to Martha, have retired from the bustle and temptation of the world, to adore their God in solitude and in silence :

"Who quit a world where strong temptations try,

"And since 'tis hard to combat, learn to fly."

Without taking into consideration the preference which the Almighty has generally been pleased to show to a secluded and ascetic life, no one has a right to complain of the pious refuge from temptation, and retreat from the attractive, yet dissipating pleasures of the world, of so many devout persons, but those who are able to fulfil the duties and obligations of a Christian *amidst the cares, the riches, and the pleasures of this life*. These are the only persons who, with any justice, can complain of the seclusion of so much virtue, and the loss of so much good example to mankind: yet when they consider the difficulties they themselves have daily to contend with, they will not be so ready to condemn the more timorous, but, perhaps, safer and wiser resolution, of withdrawing from the troubles and temptations to which they remain so fearfully exposed.

ever yet appeared of such exalted piety, such mortified passions, such holy meekness, such unwearyed zeal, and such sublime devotion, as to render him worthy of being held up to the people as the pattern of a saint, or a model of the man of God. It is the prerogative of Catholicity alone to furnish such examples.

The Protestant churches are not *holy*, because they have never been sanctified by the manifestation of miracles. No Protestant teacher ever yet wrought a miracle in confirmation of his faith, whereas, there is no country in the world which has been converted to christianity by Catholic missionaries—and few there are which have not been both edified by their virtues, and enlightened by their doctrine—without the miraculous interposition of Divine Providence having been exerted in its favour.⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Catholics are often accused of lending too easy a belief to miracles, though generally without reason. It is surely natural that those who believe *firmly* in the truth of their religion, should be more disposed to expect supernatural proofs of its authenticity; and it is upon the firmness of their faith alone that this predisposition is grounded, not upon any superstitious feelings, or excess of credulity. On the other hand, an obstinate disbelief of miracles, when clear to the evidence of the senses, would appear to be characteristic of an unsound religion, and of perversity of intention. The Scripture informs us,

No Protestant minister ever yet executed the following commission of our Saviour—a commis-

that the very day on which St. Peter had healed the sick, he was, for this crime of producing a miraculous evidence of Christianity, apprehended, and thrown into prison, from which he was delivered only by another miracle. When St. Stephen was brought before the council, *they saw his face as if it had been the face of an angel*, and yet they condemned him to death! When the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, and imparted to them the gift of tongues, the people exclaimed: *These men are full of new wine!* Such was the obduracy and incredulity of the enemies of the Doctrine of Christ. As it was with his Disciples, so had it been with Christ himself. When our Saviour, armed only with a scourge, but supported by the power of God, drove the multitude of profaners from the temple, the Jews said to him: *By what miracle do you prove to us your right to do these things?* as if the very act they had just witnessed was not itself a miracle, and the evidence of a supernatural power. They ask for one miracle to prove another, like those sectarians and unbelievers, who ask for evidence upon evidence in favour of a truth which has already the mark of heaven upon it, and the Revelations of God to establish it. They act like the Pharisees and Sadducees of old, who, immediately after witnessing the most astonishing miracles, asked our Saviour for a sign; but, instead of granting their request, he only condemned their unbelieving curiosity, censured the voluntary blindness in which their pride and obstinacy had involved them, referred them to the signs that had just passed, and to another that was to come. That other sign arrived: it

sion which, to the honour and credit of the Catholic Church, has been so literally fulfilled in a thousand instances by *her* pastors, not only in primitive times, but in every age of Christianity. *And going... heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils.*^(u) *They went forth and preached every where, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed.*^(v)

The Church of England is not *holy* in her Ministers, because she disallows the sacrament of Holy Orders; and without it, how can her pastors be qualified for the arduous duties of the shepherds of the flock of Christ? How are they to discharge the awful duty of *rendering an account of the souls* entrusted to their care.^(y) Without the peculiar graces of Almighty God, (and how are they to receive those graces but through the sacraments, the only means we have of applying

verified all those which had gone before, it was the sign which they had so eagerly and so importunately demanded:—but they remained perverse in their judgment, and obdurate in their infidelity.—How merited, then, was the reproof which Jesus so soon afterwards pronounced even on his own disciples: *Do you not yet know, nor understand? Have you still your heart blinded? Having eyes, see you not? and having ears, hear you not?* (St. Mark viii. 17, 18.)

^(u) St. Matt. x. 7. 8.

^(x) St. Mark, xvi. 20.

^(y) Heb. xiii. 17.

the merits of our Redeemer to our soul,) how, it may be asked, are they to be holy and vigilant watchmen of the Lord? *Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day, and all the night, they shall never hold their peace.*^(z) In fine, if they use not holy orders as a sacrament, how can her ministers possess the grace of God, which should be in them by the *imposition of the hands of the priesthood*?^(a) They who have extraordinary duties imposed upon them, must surely need extraordinary graces to be enabled worthily to fulfil them.

As the Church of England is not *holy* in her pastors, for the same reason she is not holy in her people.^(b) In acknowledging but two sacraments, she has narrowed the means destined to convey the graces of heaven to her followers; she has cut off so many sources for applying the merits of our Redeemer to the soul, and thereby abridged the sanctification and perfection of man.

Another proof of the want of holiness in the Protestant Church is, that those who leave the Catholic communion for the Establishment, inva-

^(z) *Isai.* lxii. 16.

^(a) *1 Tim.* iv. 14. *2 Tim.* i. 6.

^(b) Let any one read Dr. Clarke's Account of the public and private morals in Sweden, Norway, and Russia, and say whether he thinks holiness a characteristic mark of the Protestant Reformation in those countries.

riably shew by their conduct, that they do so, solely in furtherance of their worldly interests, and to enjoy a greater latitude both of faith and practice. In deserting their religion, they almost always desert their morality with it: yet, even then, they generally flatter themselves with the hope of returning to die in the bosom of the ancient faith.^(c) But how seldom does the Almighty permit them thus to trifle with him? They say within themselves: Yours is the church in which we will live at our ease, but we will return to our own, to die in penitence and peace. But as they abandon God, he abandons them in their turn; he withdraws his grace, and consigns them to their folly. Far dif-

(c) It has been no uncommon occurrence for Catholics, who for temporal motives have abjured their religion, to educate their children in the creed they had deserted, thus giving the strongest practical proof of the fallacy of their own conversion, and of the estimation in which they held the ancient faith. This was the case with the Earl of Arundell, the father of the unfortunate Lord Stafford, as well as with many others.—“Sir William Scott informs me that he heard Johnson say: ‘A man who is converted from Protestantism to Popery, *may be sincere*; he parts with nothing, he is only superadding to what he already had: but a convert from Popery to Protestantism, gives up so much of what he has held as sacred as any thing that he retains: there is so much *laceration of mind* in such a conversion, that it can hardly be sincere and lasting.’”
—(Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*.)

ferent is the conduct of converts to Catholicity; evincing the purity of their motives by the severity of their religious observances, and by the example of disinterested piety which they exhibit to the world. No one scarcely has yet left us, who has lived well, or died happily: hardly any one has yet sought and found us, who has not been a pattern of virtue while living, and a saint in death.

The extraordinary circumstance of her followers choosing rather to remain without places of divine worship, than to make any sacrifices or exertions to erect them, might also be cited as another proof of the want of holiness, or at least of zeal, in the Protestant Church. It certainly is an anomaly in the history of Christianity, that the richest church in Europe—in the most opulent country in the world—should be compelled to call upon the whole nation, not one half of whom profess the religion of the State, to supply her with temples for the celebration of her religious rites. It was far different when the present possessions of the church were in the hands of a Catholic Hierarchy. The most sumptuous buildings in the world, the wonders of each succeeding age, then every where arose in profusion, through the spontaneous zeal and piety of the clergy and the people.—In poor, degraded, insulted, and impoverished Ireland, what exertions have not a Catholic starv-

ing peasantry, and an unbeneficed clergy, made for the erection of decent places of public worship!

Thirdly.—No Protestant Church possesses that other characteristic of revealed truth, *Catholicity*, that is, universality. The Protestant Churches are not universal in point of *time*, having had no existence for upwards of 1500 years after the coming of Christ; for no one can show that the doctrine and belief of Protestants was ever professed by any individual, much less by any Church or any congregation of Christians, previous to the days of Luther. Their very name is a novelty.

No Protestant Church is universal in point of *space*, because not one of them embraces more than comparatively a very small portion of the Christian world, no where comprehending any large numbers of the flock of Christ:—no where is Protestantism any thing but a sect. If the Church of England looks for universality, she finds herself checked upon every side; she is a mere insulated province of Christendom. To be universal, she should be like the Roman Catholic,—*preached to every creature;*^(c) *carried to the uttermost parts of the earth;*^(d) *ruling from sea to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth;*^(e) *offering*

(c) *St. Mark*, xvi. 15. (d) *Acts*, i. 8. (e) *Psal.* lxxi. 8.

a clean sacrifice in every place from the rising to the setting of the sun ;^(f) extending from the sands of Syria to the deserts of Paraguay ; from schismatical Moscow to infidel Japan. To be universal,—like the Roman Catholic, she should have preserved inviolate *the everlasting covenant*,^(g) a covenant like that *of the day and the night*,^(h) to stand for all generations, which the Almighty has made with her, and confirmed by a solemn oath.⁽ⁱ⁾ By a perpetual, uninterrupted, and visible existence, she should have shown herself the constant and steady *light of the world*, the standing and living memorial of the promises of Christ ; she should have been *the mountain of the House of our Lord* in these latter days, *prepared on the top of mountains, and exalted above the hills, with all nations flowing unto it*.^(k)

There neither is, nor ever was, upon earth, any other Church to which these and numberless other prophecies can possibly be applied, but the Roman Catholic :—she is universal in point of time ; she is universal in point of space.—After an existence of more than 1800 years, we still find her every where.—We find her glorious and magnificent before the learned and the rich, under the golden dome of the Vatican, seated triumphant on the

^(f) *Malach.* ii. 11.

^(g) *Ezek.* xxxvii. 26.

^(h) *Jer.* xxxiii. 20. 21. ⁽ⁱ⁾ *Ps.* lxxxviii. 4, 36, & *Isaias*, liv. 9.

^(k) *Isaias*, ii. 2.

ruins of Paganism, and encompassed by the splendour of the Eternal City ;⁽ⁱ⁾ we find her preached to the poor and the ignorant, under the canopy of heaven, in many a distant and unfrequented clime ; we find her in the palaces of kings, and in the cities of the great ; we find her among the idolators of the Old, and the savages of the New World ;^(k) we find her in the east and in the west, in the north and in the south ; and we find her every where with the same image and likeness, always in possession of the same pure and holy doctrine. We find her to be *that great and various multitude....like the stars of heaven, or the sands*

⁽ⁱ⁾ Amongst all the Revolutions recorded in history, the most remarkable, certainly, is the establishment of the temporal sovereignty of the Popes. That the successor of St. Peter, who was crucified by order of a Roman emperor, as a mean and contemptible impostor, should now possess the capital of that empire, for the seat of his dominion, and the temples of their gods, for the rites of his religion : and that the individual who now represents the proud senate of Rome, should hold his station at the will and appointment of that same successor of St. Peter, are circumstances which appear to point out a peculiar providence, and afford matter of contemplation to the Christian philosopher.

^(k) On the missionary labours of the Catholic church, see Milner's *End of Controversy*, Lett. xxx.

of the sea,^(l)....which no man could number, of all nations, and tribes, and people, and tongues.^(m)

The very name of Catholic, which no other Church ever has assumed, or can assume, and which by universal consent is inseparably attached to her, is alone sufficient to prove her Catholicity.⁽ⁿ⁾

^(l) *Gen. xxii. 17.*

^(m) *Apoc. vii. 9.*

⁽ⁿ⁾ “The followers of Luther or Calvin are precisely the same, in his eyes, [the eyes of a Catholic] as those of Kant, or Knox, or Wesley, or any other of the numberless tribes who wander about the desert and attack the people of God, as they journey, under the divine protection, to the promised land. He may see some senate, or stadtholder, or prince, or potentate, associate himself with one or other of those sects, and bestow upon it all the wealth and dignity, which law, or rapine, or conquest placed in his hands—he may see one of them preserve much of the form, order, dignity, rites, and liturgies of the church, whilst another strips its members in the market-place, and presents itself to the world as a sad image of human fatuity, or divine wrath; but as to the unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity of the Church, all these sects, whether assembled in palaces, in the conventicle, on the moor, or on the mountain, are equally removed from them.”

The following beautiful simile will be found illustrative of the subject: “Like the material world, the Church is continually vivified by a central and divine fire, enlightened by an eternal sun, watered by a miraculous dew, by which, like nature herself, she is at once embellished and

Fourthly,—No Protestant Church is *Apostolical*, because, instead of originating with the Apostles, instead of being founded by any teacher, deputed and commissioned by authority from the apostolic college, instead of being established by men who were sent, as the Father had sent the Saviour of mankind; *as my Father has sent me, I also send you*; ^(o)and again, *how shall they preach, unless they be sent*; ^(p) they all grew out of the angry spirit, the pride, and the presumption of Luther, who, in the arrogance of his mind, set himself up in oppo-

refreshed, and endowed with a fertility which makes her bud, and bring forth fruit both for time and eternity.”—(Ganganelli’s *Letters*.) In another place, speaking of the Church, both militant and triumphant, he says: “I figure her to myself as a tree, whose top reaches the summit of the heavens, whose roots pierce to the deepest abyss, and against which all the storms let loose their rage, without being able to wither or overthrow it.”—“If we consider the church in her outward appearance, nothing can be more weak; her head and her members are men of flesh and blood, subject to all the passions; she has no other arms, no other strength than those words of Jesus Christ: *Go preach the Gospel to all nations—Lo! I am with you all days, even to the end of the world*. But, take a view of her internally, and nothing is stronger; for being unceasingly guided and enlightened by the Holy Spirit, God himself is her impregnable rampart.”

^(o) *St John*, xx. 21.

^(p) *Rom.* x. 15.

sition to the received opinions of every nation, of every age, and of every Church; and who virtually confessed, that it was impossible he himself should be right, and every body else wrong.^(q)

The Protestant Churches are not *Apostolical*, because their Hierarchies have no links to connect them with the æra of the Apostles, because they know not how *they have received the Holy Ghost*;^(r) because some of them cannot even demonstrate that their spiritual functions emanate from any other than a lay authority. They are not Apostolical, because their founders bore none of the characteristics of Apostolical men.—It is a notorious fact, that, instead of being eminent for their humility, their piety, and their morals, the first reformers, equally with their patrons, were renowned for their profaneness, their pride, and their public irregularity of life: instead of preaching by example, as well as by word, they bore testimony to the falsehood of their mission by the licentiousness of their manners.

No Protestant Church is *Apostolical*, because we

^(q) “How often,” says he, “did my trembling heart ask me; Art thou alone right? Is all the world, except thee, involved in error?” (*Præf. de abrog. Miss. Priv.*) For the extravagances, contradictions, and turbulence of this Prince of Reformers, see *Letters to a Prebendary*, Lett. v.

^(r) *St John*, xx. 22.

know from history that, in the infancy of the Reformation, instead of following the Apostolical writings and Apostolical traditions, its abettors did not scruple to torture and pervert the Sacred Text, to their own innovations, favouring their new creed by falsely pretending it to be conformable to the will of the Almighty; propagating their religion by *adulterating the word of God*, and veiling the light of the Gospel, instead of exhibiting the *manifestation of the truth*.^(s) thus impugning the known faith by fiction and deceit, and fabricating ordinances for the God of truth and holiness, in the cause of falsehood and impiety.^(t) Well may we say, with St. Paul, to the deluded victims of such iniquity: *Who hath hindered you, that you should not obey the truth?*^(u) and well might they answer; *They who changed the word of God into a lie*;^(v) the adulterators of the Sacred Text, the Protestant Reformers.^(y)

^(s) 2 Cor. iv. 2.

^(t) See Ward's *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, and Dr. Milner's *Inquiry into certain vulgar Opinions concerning the Catholic Inhabitants and Antiquities of Ireland*, pp. 271, &c.

^(u) Gal. v. 7.

^(v) Rom. i. 1. 25.

^(y) "Henry VIII., in his first essay at reformation, allowed the free use of the Bible in an authorised version, not absolutely without comment, but, as his majesty afterwards discovered, disfigured by unfaithful renderings, and contaminated with notes calculated to mislead the

The Church of England, in particular, cannot be Apostolical, because there is no saying of the Apostles, nor any Text of Scripture, nor any authority of Christ, to support the monstrous notion, that a woman of the sixteenth century should be invested with the divine right of reforming the Church of

ignorant and unwary." See Dr. Lingard's *History of England*, vol. iv. p. 309.

Zuinglius, addressing Luther concerning his Scriptural works, uses the following energetical language: "Thou dost corrupt the word of God, Luther. Thou art seen to be a manifest and common perverter of the Scriptures." Zuing. *Lib. de Sacr. ad Luth.* Op. tom. ii. See Milner's *Letters to a Preb.* p. 185.

Let us try this question by another test. Let us examine what is the main object of the two religions. The Catholic has the truth and sincerity of religion in view, to make it neither more nor less severe than it really is; to represent it in its most winning and amiable light, and, at the same time, not to divest it of its terrors or restraints. But Protestantism, on the other hand, has ever evinced a marked and decided tendency to weaken all the obligations of the Gospel, to explain away all the injunctions which are most opposed to our inclinations, to smooth the thorny path of our duties, and to admit as little as possible of what is irksome to our nature, or which necessitates the mastery of our passions. Which of the two is more likely to have corrupted the Sacred Text, to have distorted its meaning, and abridged its authority?

God, of setting herself up as the arbiter of religious faith, and the infallible teacher of fallible doctrine.

Again, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because it possesses not two other characteristic marks of the true Church, namely, constant *Visibility* and *Indefectibility*.^(z)

First,—No Protestant Church can claim any pretensions whatever to *Visibility*, because for upwards of 1500 years they were all perfectly invisible, having had no existence. To have been visible, she should always have been as the Catholic Church alone *has* been, and, as the true Church is described in Scripture, *the light of the world, like a city seated on a mountain, which cannot be hid*.^(a) No Protestant Church can be thus constantly

^(z) *Micheas*, iv. 1-2. *St. Matt.* v. 14. and xvi. 18. and xxviii. 18. 19. 20. *St. John*, xiv. 16. 26. and xvi. 13. 1 *Tim.* iii. 15.

^(a) *St. Matt.* v. 14.—Evelyn, in his memoirs, relates that Sir R. Browne, Charles the Second's Minister in Paris, returned after a nineteen years' exile, during all which time he had kept up in his chapel the liturgy and offices of the church of England, to his no small honour, and at a time when it was so low, and as many thought, utterly lost, that in various controversies, both with papists and sectaries, our Divines used to argue for the visibility of the church from *his chapel and congregation!!* Where, I would ask, was its *universality*?

visible, because they all admit within themselves the principle of error: they admit that they may fall from their foundations and vanish.—For the moment a church has erred, all truth has vanished, —has departed from it; the moment it has fallen from the truth in which it was established by our Saviour, it has ceased to be visibly the true Church. If she fail in one point, she fails in all: *He who offends in one point, is become guilty of all.*^(b) When a witness gives his evidence, in part true and in part false, is he not immediately declared to be unworthy of credit *in toto*? He is not considered as a true and credible witness, because his testimony is in part true, but he is rejected altogether as a liar and a prevaricator, because it is in part false: we do not wait to sift the good from the bad, or to try its merits in separate portions, but we at once expunge it entirely from our minds. So it is with the Church of Christ. She is the witness of the doctrines of the Gospel: if we find her bearing false testimony in one point, we should condemn her in all; we should declare her to be a false church, and unfaithful both to the promises and the commands of her divine founder. How then can a false church be visibly the church of Christ, the God of Truth! How can she be the light of the world, when she is shrouded

^(b) *St. James. ii. 10.*

in the darkness of heresy? But admitting any Protestant to be now visibly a true Church, which is a monstrous proposition, and allowing the possibility, contrary even to their own expectations, of her remaining so, for ages to come, where was her visibility in ages past? To have been a visible Church, she should have been discoverable, as the Roman Catholic Church alone is, by one direct and luminous track, through every age which has succeeded the coming of her Divine Founder. She should have been *a holy and a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle;*^(c) alike triumphant amidst the storms of persecution, and victorious over the assaults of heresy or schism.

Secondly.—No Protestant church has any title to *indefectibility*, because they are all founded upon the principle, that the Catholic church had erred. All who acknowledge themselves to be Christians, acknowledge the Catholic as the parent church; for the time was, when there was no other. They, therefore, who contend that the Catholic church had erred, necessarily admit a liability to error in the true church of Christ. For as the Catholic church was, for many ages, the only church in Christendom, she must then, at least, have been the true church, or no true church existed. Whichever be the case, there is a clear

^(c) *Ephes. v. 27.*

admission on the part of Protestants, of the fallibility of the church of Christ. It is then natural to inquire, how a fallible and erring church—a church which may preach falsehood as well as truth—a church which may be possessed with the spirit of darkness as well as the spirit of light, can be *the church of the living God*, which is *the pillar and ground of the truth*.^(d) either the promises of Christ have failed, and the *spirit of truth* has erred, or the church of God has preserved the purity of its faith and doctrine. Our Saviour, the God of light and truth, has said: *I am the light of the world: he that followeth me, walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life;*^(e) — *I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world.*^(f) He has promised the Pastors of his Church *a comforter, the spirit of truth to abide with them for ever,*^(g) *to teach them all things,*^(h) *and to teach them all truth.*⁽ⁱ⁾

Yet, in opposition to these and many other express declarations and promises of Christ, Protestants presume to say, that our Saviour has left his Church without a guide to lead her through the mists of ignorance and the mazes of error, into the ways of truth and life. They argue as if they

^(d) 1 Tim. iii. 15.

^(e) St. John viii. 12.

^(f) St. Matt. xviii. 20.

^(g) St. John xiv. 16, 17.

^(h) Ibid. 26.

⁽ⁱ⁾ St. John xvi. 13.

wished to persuade us that the God of infinite goodness and infinite justice had commanded us to believe that which we have no means of ascertaining, and that he has given us only the faint glimmerings of human reason to interpret the sublime mysteries of Divine Revelation.—They tell us that he, whose decrees are fixed and immutable, (*if these ordinances fail before me, saith the Lord, then also the seed of Israel shall fail:*⁽ⁱ⁾ and again, *Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass,*^(k)) has condemned us to seek a steadfast faith in the wavering inconsistencies of our own minds;—that *Christ, who loved his Church, so as to deliver himself up for it*, has now cruelly left it *to be tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine.*^(l) That the God of wisdom has abandoned his own work to *dishonesty and craftiness;*^(m) and that *the good shepherd, who laid down his life for his flock,*⁽ⁿ⁾ has now thrown it a prey to *false prophets, who come in sheep's clothing, but who inwardly are ravening wolves.*^(o)

Again; our Saviour declared to St. Peter, that he built his Church upon a rock, *and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it:*^(p) yet Protestants pretend that the words of the Godhead have been falsified; that the Church of Christ was built upon

(i) *Jeremiah*, xxxi. 36. (k) *Ephes.* v. 25. (l) *Eph.* iv. 14.

(m) *2 Cor.* iv. 2. (n) *St. John*, x. 15. (o) *St. Matt.* vii. 15.

(p) *St. Matt.* xvi. 18.

sand, and not upon a rock, that the powers of darkness have prevailed over the spirit of light, and that *the pillar of truth* has been overthrown by the machinations of *the father of lies*. To shew the force of the declaration that the Church was built upon a rock, our Saviour elsewhere says : *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.*^(P) But Protestants, in maintaining that the Church of Christ had been torn from its foundations by the force of error, most pointedly falsify these words of the Son of God. They say that the Church was built upon sand ; that the rain descended, the floods came, the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell ; for it was founded upon sand. They say, that the Eternal Wisdom is not so wise as man, and that instead of building secure from the storms of persecution, and the blasts of heresy, he lays his foundations upon a shallow and a tottering basis. They say that the omnipotent arm of the Deity has refused to uphold his own work from destruction ; that the right hand of God is shortened for the protection of *his chosen generation*,

^(P) *S. Matt.* xxvii. 24, 25.

his kingly Priesthood, his holy nation, his purchased people.^(q) They would have us believe, that our faith reposes upon *the wisdom of men, and not upon the power of God.*^(r)

Innumerable are the texts of Scripture to prove that *indefectibility* is a necessary mark of the true Church, and innumerable and uninterrupted are the testimonies to shew, that the Roman Catholic Church alone possesses this characteristic. *This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My Spirit that is in thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*^(s)

Such is the promise of the Almighty to his people; such is the declaration of his fidelity to his Church: and *the truth of the Lord remaineth for ever.*^(t) From the vocation of Abraham to the coming of our Redeemer, the seed of Israel never failed; they suffered a persecution of 400 years in the bondage of Egypt; numbers of them apostatized; they rebelled against their Maker, and they were led captive into Babylon: at one moment they triumphed in victory and prosperity—at another they mourned in defeat and disaster; at one

(q) 1 St. Peter, ii. 9. (r) 1 Cor. ii. 5. (s) Isai. lix. 21.

(t) Psl. cxvi. 2.

period they were a free, a numerous, a powerful, and a wealthy people ; at another, they were reduced to the extremity of slavery, poverty, and ruin ;—they were encompassed by enemies on every side ; they were desolated with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, but their race was never extinguished,—the true religion was never lost : there always remained a chosen few, whose virtue was invincible, and whose faith withstood every temptation ; *who never bowed the knee to Baal ;*^(u) *but who walked in the name of the Lord their God.*^(x)

So has it been with the Catholic Church, of which the Jewish dispensation was but a type. She was persecuted, and she rose up stronger and more glorious from persecution ; she was assailed by heresy and schism, and she acquired force and stability from the attacks of her enemies. The Lord has set his *sanctuary in the midst of her for evermore ;*^(y) she has always *walked in his judgments, and observed his statutes ;*^(z) she is always guided by *one shepherd,*^(a) and *illuminated by the everlasting light.*^(b) In fine, she alone is, she alone can be infallible, because she alone has ever been true to herself : setting all the prophecies and every text of Scripture aside, she alone can be

^(u) Rom. xi. 4. ^(x) Micheas, ii. v. ^(y) Ezekiel, xxxvii. 26.

^(z) Lev. xviii. 5. ^(a) St. John, x. 16. ^(b) Isaiah, lx. i.

infallible, because she alone has ever declared herself in possession of infallibility. No other Church has ever advanced any pretensions to it. All others are founded upon the fallibility and infirmity of man, without any regard to the promises and the power of God.

To pursue the same reasoning.—As the Almighty gave the Israelites a pillar of fire to guide them through the obscurity of night, and a cloud to conduct them during the day, through a strange and hostile country; so has the same beneficent Being given us, in consideration of the same necessity, a bright and safe conductor through the dangerous and toilsome pilgrimage of this world, a never-failing, a never-erring Church. And, as the Jewish people were ordered to *observe and do whatever was commanded them by the Scribes and Pharisees who sat in the chair of Moses,*^(a) so are we commanded to hear and obey those who sit in the chair of St. Peter, and fill the stations of the Apostles;^(b) they who are appointed by the same power and for the same purpose, namely, for the interpretation of the Law of God. That this law has always received the same interpretation from this divinely appointed tribunal; that the same articles of faith have always been proposed to our

^(a) *St. Matt.* xxiii. 2, 3. ^(b) *St. Matt.* xviii. 17. —
xxviii. 20. *St. Luke*, x. 16. *Heb.* xiii. 7, 17. 1 *Ep. John*, iv. 6.

belief, and the same precepts held up for our observance—is a truth to which there is the strongest and most perfect chain of evidence to conduct us; a truth which Protestants deny in vain; a truth which most incontestibly establishes the triumph and the indefectibility of the Roman Catholic Church.

From all that has been advanced, it follows as a matter of course, that I cannot conform to Protestantism. I cannot, if it were only for this reason; that, when I read in Scripture, that *he that believeth not shall be condemned*,^(c) I cannot trust so important a concern as my religious belief to a Church which may deceive me. We know that *the ways of God are so straight, that even fools shall not err therein*.^(d) We know also, that, in Scripture, *there are things hard to be understood*,^(e) which the unlearned and

(c) *St. Mark*, xvi. 16.

(d) *Isai.* xxxv. 8.

(e) In Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, we find the following passage: "*Mrs. Knowles*.—She had the New Testament before her. *Johnson*.—Madam, she could not understand the New Testament, the most difficult book in the world, for which the study of a life is required. *Mrs. Knowles*.—It is clear as to essentials. *Johnson*.—But not as to controversial points." *Vol.* iii. p. 324. Are not all points, even the most essential, controverted by the different denominations of Christians?

—"St. Augustin observes, (*Lib. I. contra Cress.* 33.) that it is only by the Church we know what is the sense of

the unstable wrest to their own destruction;^(f) that *false prophets come in the clothing of sheep* to ensnare us;^(g) that there are never wanting those who would *make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine;*^(h) and that there will always *arise men speaking perverse things, to draw disciples away after them;*⁽ⁱ⁾ *erring and driving into error.*^(k)

With such facilities on the one hand, and with such difficulties and dangers on the other, is it not folly, is it not madness, to trust to a Church which bears the insignia of error upon her forehead, and owns herself incapable of protecting us? If we dis-

Scripture, or what is not. His words are: 'The truth of the Scripture is held by us, or we possess the true meaning of them, when we do that which is approved of in the whole church, which church the authority of the Scriptures themselves commends:'—so far removed was he from the opinion of those who would undertake to determine religious doubts, by the very book, from the misunderstanding of which they all arise. This the holy doctor, (*Tract. 18. in Johan. Cap. 5.*) expressly attests, in the following words: 'Heresies have arisen, and certain perverse doctrines, ensnaring souls, and precipitating them into the abyss, have been broached, only when the good Scriptures have been badly understood, and when that which was badly understood, was rashly and boldly attested.'—*Reply to Dr. Magee*, p. 12.

(f) 2 Ep. St. Peter, iii. 10.

(g) St. Matt. vii. 15.

(h) Rom. xvi. 17.

(i) Acts, xx. 30.

(k) 2 Tim. iii. 13. See *Dr. Doyle's Defence*, p. 88.

own her authority, which her principles well warrant us to do, and have recourse to private interpretation, do we not immediately fall into presumption, by searching, in the infirmity and inconsistency of our own minds, for the discovery of that firm and steadfast faith, without which we shall be condemned? Is it not incomparably safer to rely upon the united wisdom, talents, virtue, and experience of the good and great in every age; upon a representative assembly of the universal Church, under the sacred guidance of the Holy Spirit? *It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us,*^(l) are the remarkable and emphatic words used by the first council of the Church, in promulgating its decisions. Protestants, however, say that the Holy Ghost is no longer our guide; but as if to silence their doubts, and compel their submission, our Saviour himself declares the contrary; he says, *his Paraclete shall abide with his Church for ever, and lead her into all truth;*^(m) and, in consequence, he declares us no better than *heathens or publicans,*⁽ⁿ⁾ if we refuse to hear her. Still, Protestants say: We owe no obedience to the Church; let us follow the guidance of our own fancy, for the Almighty will not require our allegiance, where he has given no power to rule. But, as if again to confound their presumption, and to give

(l) *Acts*, xv. 28. (m) *St. John*, xiv. 16, 26. (n) *St. Matt.* xviii. 17.

a clear confirmation of his doctrine, our Saviour inspires his apostles thus to admonish and instruct the faithful: *Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops, to rule the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.*^(o) Such are the words of Scripture, and yet Protestants maintain that the Church has no authority; that the Hierarchy has no divine commission to rule the Church of Christ.

Again I repeat, that I cannot conform to Protestantism, because I cannot trust so important a concern as my religious creed, to a church which must necessarily be fickle and inconstant in her doctrine, and may, perhaps, altogether cease to exist. Because, as such, she can never lead me to any fixed and certain faith; since as she "claims the twofold privileges of changing her tenets at will, and of being infallible at every change,"^(p)

^(o) *Acts*, xx. 28.

^(p) "The right of private judgment, as allowed by the established church, was a sort of an apology for her own revolt, and a sacrifice made to the Baal of puritanism; but it is opposed to the letter and spirit of the church creed, as well as incompatible with the gospel, which foretels of heresies and schisms; for if the right of private judgment, in opposition to the declared decision of the church, exist, it is utterly impossible that heresy should be damnable, or schism a crime. Every church, then,

she can never answer the end proposed by the immutable God of Truth—that of pointing out his ways, and expounding his doctrine. During the period in which she is wedded to her errors, she is evidently incapable of being the teacher of truth; and even in the season of her greatest purity, her liability to error must always disqualify her for that office: for though she may teach truth to day, we have no assurance that she will continue to do so to morrow; and, under such circumstances, who shall pretend to say when truth fails, and falsehood begins,—who shall tell us when she is possessed with *the spirit of error*, and when with *the spirit of Truth*?^(q)

If I am unable to repose my confidence on such a church, and it is evident I cannot, only two alternatives remain:—I must either submit implicitly to some safe and certain guide, or, as I

that excommunicates authors of heresy, that is, men who, exercising their right of private judgment, choose their own religion; or which casts out among the heathen the maintainers of conventicles, (all which the established church does) is guilty, if guilt it be, of denying the right of private judgment, and of exercising, thereby, a dominion over conscience. Whether the church, doing so, claim infallibility or not, is nothing to the purpose; her judgment, and the effects of it to the excommunicated persons, are the same.”—*Reply to Dr. Magee.*

^(q) 1 *St. John*, iv. 6.

have said before, follow my own private interpretation. But this latter course, though so repugnant to reason and common sense, is yet so generally prevalent among Protestants, that, in my mind, it forms another very powerful argument against conformity to their principles. Considering the fluctuations of opinion necessarily attending the person who frames his creed merely by the light of his own judgment in the interpretation of the scriptures, it is utterly impossible he can ever attain to that firmness of belief on which a rational man would ground the security of his faith; or if by such inadequate and disproportionate means, he should form to himself some consistency of mind upon the subject, he must, at least, be guilty of presumption, in venturing upon that which the wisest and best men in Christendom have always declared themselves incapable of accomplishing.

But there are not wanting those, who, seeing the difficulties of their situation, boldly contend that a diversity of opinion in matters of faith destroys not the unity of religion. This is a doctrine so monstrous, that it is impossible to read a chapter in the inspired writings, and not feel convinced of the falsity of such a position. It is at variance with the very principles of the Reformation, because, if unity of faith were not necessary, why make a schism in the church in favour of any particular code of tenets? It is at variance with

reason, because it is unreasonable that we, who are the children of obedience, should be permitted to follow our own fancy in interpreting the immutable word of God: it is at variance with revelation, because it destroys charity, which is the essence of religion,^(r) because revelation says: *speak all the same thing, and let there be no schisms among you.*^(s)

If a diversity of religious opinions were permitted, whence all those denunciations against innovators and false teachers? Why does the Apostle so often and so strenuously insist upon *unity*? Why does he exclaim, *Is Christ divided?*^(t) *God is not the God of dissension, but of*

^(r) 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2. ^(s) 1 Cor. i. 10. ^(t) 1 Cor. i. 13.

Jesus Christ, praying to his Father for his apostles and disciples, says: *As thou hast sent me into this world, I also have sent them into the world. And for them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth.... That they all may be one as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee: that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as we also are one.* (St. John xvii.) How could truth and unity be more clearly and more energetically inculcated?

The following passages are to the same effect. St. Paul, writing to the first Christians, says: *For first of all I hear that when you come together in the church, there are schisms amongst you; and in part I believe it. For there*

peace.^(u) Many also hush the voice of conscience, and, while they strive to vindicate their conduct to themselves, plead for their apology, that their faith is complete if they believe, in what they call, the grand leading tenets of Christianity; and in consequence they profess to consider doctrinal points as matters of minor importance. But so

must be heresies, that they also who are approved, may be made manifest among you. (1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.) Again; Be of one mind, have peace; and the God of peace and of love shall be with you. (2 Cor. xiii. 11.) But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who brought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. (2 St. Peter, ii. 1.) My brethren, if any of you err from the truth, and one convert him, he must know that he who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his way, shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.” (St. James, v. 20.) For such false Apostles are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ. (2 Cor. xi. 13.) The word of the Lord endureth for ever, and this is the word which has been preached unto you. (1 St. Peter i. 25.) We are of God: he that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth us not: by this we know the spirit of Truth, and the spirit of error. (1 St. John iv. 6.) How true it is that error does, will, and must exist: and that truth is immutable and enduring, and always discoverable, if we will but apply the proper means, and have recourse to the proper sources.

^(u) 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

far from this being the reality, there is not the slightest doubt but that we shall stand or fall, we shall live or die, by our faith in doctrinal points.

We may find a striking illustration of this in the doctrine of the real presence. The Israelites in Egypt were informed that, unless they were sprinkled with the blood of the paschal lamb, they should be destroyed. Our Saviour informs *us*, that *except we eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, we shall not have life in us.*^(y) Is it, then, a matter of minor importance whether we are to live or die, and that eternally too? and yet the words of Christ declare that this depends upon our eating his flesh and drinking his blood. But do Protestants do this? They frequent the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper — but do they there eat of his flesh and drink of his blood? They say they do not. We say we do, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.—Is it, then, a matter of minor importance to have this point decided, on which depends everlasting life? Is it a case of little moment, whether we have a false or a true faith, upon a doctrine involving such stupendous consequences? *As, without faith, it is impossible to please God,*^(z) so, without faith, even though we should be the partakers of it, it is impossible to live by this bread of life.

^(y) *St. John*, vi. 53.

^(z) *Hebrews*, xi. 5.

Many also—hold the preposterous idea of an amalgamation of truth and falsehood in the true Church of Christ, and are satisfied with it in this state; but surely, if the religion of the God of truth once becomes contaminated with error, it ceases to be his. By superadding new and unwarranted doctrines, or by denying the smallest article of the Christian faith, she errs as much as if she rejected the greatest mysteries of our belief, because the smallest rests upon the same authority as the greatest, *not upon the wisdom of men, but upon the power of God.*^(a) If she has failed in one point, she has failed in all: *He that offends in one point, is guilty of all.*^(b) Truth is essentially one—she associates not with error, without the loss of her reputation. *What fellowship hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial?*^(c) If there be a true Church, and undoubtedly there is, that Church is true, in every sense of the word. She is not an unnatural combination of truth and falsehood, a chaotic mixture of light and darkness, which neither the ingenuity nor the capacity of man can separate or distinguish. She is the truth, and *only* the truth; not true in some doctrines, and false in others; but, like the God by whom she was established, and by whom she is still protected and directed, she is TRUTH itself.

^(a) 1 Cor. ii. 5. ^(b) St. James, ii. 10. ^(c) 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.

But to return to our argument :—Let us take, for instance, this same doctrine of the real presence, and see whether reason can guide us into any settled faith concerning it. Catholics and Greeks believe in Transubstantiation, and Lutherans in Consubstantiation, while the Church of England, perhaps, rejects the real presence altogether. Yet, this contrariety of belief is all grounded upon the self-same texts of Scripture. The light of reason directs us all, and yet we all arrive at opposite conclusions : and how can it be otherwise ? How is it possible, amidst such a variety of opinions, to *reason* ourselves into any decided judgment ?^(c)

^(c) Dr. Doyle, writing upon this subject, observes :—“ The numerous and discordant sects which, since the 16th century, have sprung up in the midst of the Slavonic nations, which, as Leibnitz observes, then separated themselves from the Latin Church and name, afford ample evidence of the insufficiency of human reason, or of the scriptures, interpreted by private judgment, to preserve unity in the body of Christ ; as also of the absolute necessity of a controlling and supreme church authority to preserve such unity, and check the spirit of religious innovation.

“ These sectaries, like a discomfited army, having been driven from one position to another—from reason to the scriptures—from the scriptures to the scriptures interpreted by the judgment of each individual—from the scriptures so interpreted, to the same interpreted by the interior unction or taste of the Spirit ; driven, in fact, from

Let us take another illustration :—After instituting the Sacrament of the Eucharist, our Saviour

absurdity to absurdity, with the mark of schism, like that of Cain, imprinted on their forehead, without possessing one church, or one altar, throughout the kingdom, connected in any way with those which were Catholic and Apostolic; they, in the delirium of their revolt, sought to break down the church herself into an immense mass of confused and jarring elements, preferring a place in this chaos to a recognition of their errors, and to the obtaining, by a dutiful submission, a place in that house of peace and unity, from which, in a moment of passion, they had departed. They said that the church of God, the kingdom of the Redeemer, the body of Christ, consisted of every sect and every heresy which invoked the name of the Lord. When they first broached this monstrous opinion, it was said to them, (*Psal. lxxiii.*) *and his house is in peace.* Are those contending sectaries the *men of good will* to whom the angels announced at Bethlehem, (*Luke ii. 14*) that Christ came to bring peace upon earth?

Are they, who contend one with another even to excommunication, that strong body, which, drawing its strength from its union, is called by Christ himself *a rock*? Are these sectaries that one fold, under one pastor, spoken of by our Lord, (*John, x. 16.*) where all hear the same voice, where all feed on the same pasture, where altar is not erected against altar, but where all are one body who partake of the same bread? Is it possible, that he, who came to gather together in one, the children of God who were dispersed, (*John, xvii. 11.*) should assemble them only to contend with one another? Is it for an assemblage of

said: DO THIS IN COMMEMORATION OF ME; and he imposed a positive command thereby. Our Saviour also said, and that upon the same occasion, *You ought to wash one another's feet, for I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, so do you also.*^(d) Yet nothing is more certain than that no positive command is conveyed by these words. But how do we know it?—By reason? No. Reason would say that one command is equal to another; if both proceed from the same authority, both are equally binding. But reason, singly, has no sway over such questions. No: it is not within the province of the weak and fallible guidance of our own limited capacity, alone to conduct us through the maze of religious controversy. We must have recourse to some superior power, to the divine Spirit of truth, to those whom the Holy Ghost has appointed *to rule the Church of God.*^(e)

discordant sects; that Christ prayed, saying: "Holy Father, keep them in thy name, whom thou hast given to me, that they may be one as you and I are one?" (*John*, xvii. 11.) Was it for such assemblage he invoked the spirit of peace, saying to his Apostles: "Peace be to you; as my Father sent me, so I send you: and, having said this, he breathed on them, saying; Receive ye the Holy Ghost." (*John*, 20, 21, 22.)—*Reply to Dr. Magee.*

^(d) *St. John*, xiii. 14. 15.

^(e) *Acts*, c. xx. v. 28, &c. "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost that placed

Talent, genius, ignorance, and simplicity, must alike bow to this tribunal. We must no longer give a pretended superiority to human reason over Divine Revelation. This is 'the head and front of our offending;' this is the spring and essence of heresy; and till this spirit of pride, disobedience, and presumption shall yield to a meekness and docility, *bringing into captivity all understanding unto the obedience of Christ*; ^(f) till we consider the 'sun of Revelation as brighter than the twilight of our reason,' the same miserable effects, dissension and division, doubt and error, will continue to flow from the same corrupted sources. Without a centre of unity, without *those ancient bounds which our fathers have set*, ^(g) without a rallying point to which all may fly, without a tribunal of final decision, from which no appeal can be made, we shall never rest satisfied or secure.

This tribunal can be no other than that which the Eternal Wisdom has appointed to preserve with jealous care the sacred deposit of his law, a

you Bishops, to rule the Church of God, which he had purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock: and of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

(f) ii Cor. x. 5.

(g) Prov. xxii. 28.

representative assembly of the universal church, the concurring opinion of those whom the Holy Ghost has placed to rule it. Here all doubts are quieted, and all dissensions allayed;—here the weak are strengthened, and the strong are confirmed, in their faith;—here we tread with a firm step; and while others are tossed to and fro by every wind and wave, we remain secure upon the steadfast rock. It is by this we preserve the *unity of the spirit in the bond of peace*; ^(g) through this *we believe and are saved*; ^(h) by this *with one mind and with one mouth we glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. ⁽ⁱ⁾

Independently of all this, which to my mind brings full and entire conviction, and assures me in the clearest terms which of the two is the safer and the better church; many other reasons may be urged, and many other arguments may be advanced, against conformity to Protestantism.

In the *Third* place, therefore, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because, instead of being governed by any fixed principles, it is full of contradictions and inconsistencies.

It is inconsistent,—because in rejecting the spiritual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, Protestants have established a much more arbitrary spiritual jurisdiction and

(g) *Ephes.* iv. 3. (h) *St. Mark*, xvi. 16. (i) *Rom.* xv. 6.

supremacy in the person of a layman, a woman, or even of a child, by ascribing to Henry VIII. and his successors the power of deciding on heresies, schisms, and all doctrinal points; a power never entrusted by the Catholic Church to any Pope whatever.^(*) It is inconsistent, because in the 20th article of her formulary, the Church of England declares that the church hath authority in controversies of faith. If so, why does a modern, isolated church, that has separated herself from the great family of Christendom—that was founded by a haughty and voluptuous prince, not by a meek and mortified Apostle—that has modelled her doctrines and her discipline, not by the canons of any general council, but by the acts of a national parliament;^(†) —why does *such* a one deny the same power to a church who traces through eighteen centuries an uninterrupted descent from the Apostles—who stands illustrious by the piety and learning of a thousand saints and scholars—who has

(*) See Dr. Milner's *History of Winchester*, p. 364. vol. 1.

(†) I know it is said that the parliament does not define doctrines, but only proposes them: but it is equally true that no tenet can be a doctrine of the Church of England, which is not first sanctioned and promulgated by an act of parliament. The authority of the church, in matters of faith, is subservient to the parliament, not having the right to frame a single article, without her sanction. Such has been, almost always, her undeviating practice.

beheld her pastors assembled from every region of the Christian world, in eighteen general councils, to bear witness to her faith,—and who looks forth upon a hundred nations, dwelling within her fold, and constituting the true kingdom of God upon earth?

Again,—the Protestant church is inconsistent in holding the impossibility of performing a work of supererogation;^(m) for, at the same time that she acknowledges the efficacy of fasting, confession, and other acts of humility and mortification, she seldom recommends, and never enforces, their observance. If she considered them necessary, she would enforce them; but as she is content only to recommend them, she must, of necessity, account them as works of supererogation. Of those who deny the power of performing a work of supererogation, let us ask an explanation of the following words of scripture: *And some fell upon good ground, and brought forth fruit that grew up,*

(m) “ Voluntary works, besides, over, and above God’s commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas, Christ saith plainly: ‘ When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.’ ”—14th of 39 Articles.

and increased and yielded, one thirty, another sixty, and another a hundred.⁽ⁿ⁾ Hence, is it not clear that a produce of *thirty* fold will make us acceptable in the sight of God? And is it not equally clear, that by a life of greater perfection, by a stricter compliance with the severer precepts of the gospel, by following the counsels as well as the commands of Christ, we may attain to a much fuller measure of the riches of his bounty—to *sixty* or a *hundred* fold? The parable of the pounds is equally in point: he who had gained but five pounds, was rewarded as a good and faithful servant, while he who had gained ten, he who had done more than was exacted of him, was still more liberally rewarded.^(o)

Elsewhere our Saviour has also said: *If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.*^(p) This surely is not a command, but a counsel; not a work of necessity, but one of absolute perfection. No one can say that the observance of this precept is necessary for salvation, yet none can deny its superior efficacy and virtue, without falsifying the words of Christ. What, then, is it but a work of supererogation? a conduct which will render us more perfect fol-

⁽ⁿ⁾ *St. Mark*, iv. 8.

^(o) *St. Luke*, xix. 24.

^(p) *St. Matt.* xix. 21.

lowers of our Saviour, and more deserving in the sight of God; more worthy to receive a *hundred fold*, and to possess life everlasting?^(q) Yet, when we have done all this, we are still, and most truly, *unprofitable servants*;^(r) because it is not in the power of man to do any thing that is profitable to his Creator. We are only profitable to ourselves, in serving that Creator well. Neither can we perform for him any service which we do not owe him, a thousand and a thousand times. We are unprofitable servants, because we have nothing good in ourselves, but receive all through the merits of our Redeemer, and the efficacy of his sacred passion and sufferings: “God,” as St. Augustin says, “crowning his own gifts, when he crowns the good works of his servants.”

In the *Fourth* place,—I cannot conform to Protestantism, because I have no means of discovering its tenets; because I can find no one to instruct me in its doctrine. As to the thirty-nine articles, they are every where openly impugned, or totally disregarded.^(s) If we apply to her pastors, we find them all in doubts and difficulties. Bishop Watson, in a Charge to his Clergy, in 1795, says; “I think

^(q) *St. Matt.* xix. 29.

^(r) *St. Luke*, xvii. 10.

^(s) See the disputes about the meaning of the Thirty-nine Articles, and the *quo animo* with which they are to be subscribed.

it safer to tell you *where they* [the Christian doctrines] *are contained*, than *what they* are. They are contained in the Bible, and if, in reading that book, your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity should be different from those of your neighbour, or from *those of the Church*, be persuaded, on your part, that infallibility belongs as little to you as it does to the Church!" In another, he informs them, that Protestantism consists in believing what each one pleases, and in professing what he believes!! This, indeed, I have always thought to be the truest definition of Protestantism, which is no where agreed, but in one single point—that of *protesting against Catholicity*. She is, in fact, little more than a negative religion, a mere renunciation of *Romanism*. Her articles of faith have always been received more as civil edicts, emanating from a lay authority, and as safeguards to scare away that phantom-monster, Popery, than as definitions of the true religion of God. Many even profess their adherence to the Established Church to arise more from a feeling of loyalty and attachment to existing institutions, than from any assurance that she holds a better or a purer creed than any other of the various sects of Protestantism.⁽¹⁾ Catholicism, on the

(1) "It is the humour of some men," says the Protestant Dr. Heylin, "to call any separation from the Church of Rome, the Gospel; and the greater the separation, the

contrary, is not a *system of opinions*, it is a *collection of facts*. It is a series of historical

more pure the Gospel.”—Of Dr. Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury in the time of James I., Lord Clarendon observes, that he considered “the Christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled popery, *valuing those men most who did it most furiously*.” How many have been weighed in the same scales, in times much nearer to our own!

I am sorry to be obliged, in our own defence, to exhibit such a picture of Protestantism; though I am not aware that I have in any way, exaggerated the deformity of the portrait. But when we see ourselves condemned in the futile nonsense, regularly doled out by ministers of the Church of England and others, to a devouring multitude, in the shape of sermons and lectures; when we are assailed by hosts of impious pamphlets, issuing also from “ministers of the Church of England,” who, by fighting with their vizors down, prove their cowardice and their shame;—when we are reviled in more courteous and measured language in *Charges*, printed “at the request of the clergy” to whom they are delivered;—when the presumed errors of Popery are made the point of many a text, and the burden of many a spiritual philippic, in almost every pulpit throughout the kingdom;—when there are many who do, and few who are not willing to swear, that they believe us to be idolators:—when, to crown the whole, we are punished with pains and penalties for crimes expressly invented for us, are we to be denied even the weapons of Truth in our defence? When we are daily called upon, both by the legislature and the clergy, to desert the *mystery of iniquity*, to come out of Babylon, that ‘prodigious structure of imposture and wick-

documents, supported on indubitable and incontrovertible evidence; evidence which has been carried

edness,' and to take refuge under the tents of the establishment; and then are taunted and scoffed at for our rejection of their offers:—are we to be denied the privilege of declaring *why* we prefer the security of the fold of the shepherd in which we now repose, to the dangers of the trackless wilderness to which we are so importunately invited?

The almost total absence of religious instruction, especially on doctrinal points, observable in the charges, and other publications of the prelates and ministers of the Establishment, just alluded to, goes far to prove what I have stated above, that in practice, Protestantism is now become little more than a negative religion. It consists only of two propositions: That *it is just and lawful to defend the temporalities of the Establishment, by calumniating Catholics, and marking them as a caste among the people*, and, That *the bible, and the bible alone, is the religion of Protestants*. We are even told that this last proposition has passed into a familiar maxim. But, when we ask to know what the bible contains, we plunge at once into a fathomless ocean,—we arrive at nothing fixed or sure,—we fight as with men beating the air—they wander to and fro—they repeat negative propositions, but as to any thing positive and certain, we may as well look for substance in a shadow. The Church of England has so often exchanged her doctrine, for the preservation of *unity* in the kingdom, pretending, at each exchange, to have been directed by the Holy Spirit,* that, as if ashamed of her ver-

* See the *Articles and Liturgy*, as they stood in 1548; clearly expressing the real presence; in 1552 as clearly denying it; in 1562, leaving it doubtful, and in 1662 apparently rejecting it altogether!!

down upon the stream of time, from generation to generation, during a period of eighteen hundred years.

satility of character, she is become more circumspect in her public professions of faith. She has allowed upwards of a hundred and fifty years to pass over without announcing any new method of *preventing a diversity of judgment* amongst her followers. She has chosen the wiser course, to retain the same ostensible articles, but, adopting the whole Bible as her creed, to remain silent and slumbering at her post, and to permit her children to range at large among the mazes of speculative belief, as long as they disturb her not by open revolt, nor break their licence by venturing within the precincts of *Popery*, which is the only forbidden fruit in that spiritual garden of Eden,—“the liberty of believing what each one pleases.” But, while they are allowed to gather from every other tree, the moment they presume to eat of *that*, not only does their spiritual death ensue, but, they are banished from the paradise, the earth is cursed in their regard, and they are, for ever after, condemned to labour and to toil, in a land fertile only in thorns and thistles.

I am sure there is no exaggeration in all this: and if it be offensive to hear these truths, it is much more so to be obliged to write them; since we are not only the objects, but the *victims*, of that system, against which we are endeavouring to defend ourselves. In a case like the present, charity rather compels us to speak the whole truth, than to conceal any portion of it. For the greater the evil, the more ought it to arrest attention, and the more loudly should it demand a remedy. If the spirit of discord which

In the *Fifth* place, I cannot conform to Protestantism, because it rejects the doctrine of Purga-

is abroad, be not considered an evil to the country, the minds of our rulers must be modelled on principles far removed from reason; and if it be considered such, the remedy is in their own hands. The wand of Circe never wrought a more complete and sudden transformation than would be effected by the magic of just and equitable laws. Were it no longer the supposed interest of one party to maintain an ascendancy over the other, by any means but those of virtue and of truth, England would rid herself of sectarian dissension, that plague which now preys upon her very vitals; and religious harmony and tranquillity would be restored throughout the empire. If it should prove otherwise, we must then indeed acknowledge, that some heavy and peculiar curse has fallen upon the country.

When we are no longer vilified as idolators, and condemned to the alternative of either conforming to the establishment, or of being incapacitated for the exercise of civil rights, we may defend our own religion, without exposing that of others. Its truth, happily, does not depend upon the falsehood or impiety of other societies of Christians; it rests upon its own transcendant merits; and upon these, alone, we are ready to rely for its vindication. We now adhere to it, for its own purity and perfection, through evil report and good report—in peace or in persecution—in its glory or in its abjection;—as our fathers revered it in its prosperity, so do we cling to it in its adversity. We know that our religion was reared in trouble, and will live on in trouble; we know that she will survive both us and our oppressors; and that whether

tory.—We know that *nothing defiled can enter heaven*; ^(u) we know also that, *in the sight of God, no man living shall be justified*; ^(x) and our Saviour himself has declared, that *every idle word that men shall speak, they shall render an account of, in the day of judgment*; ^(y) how then, with the dangers and distractions of the world around us, with the weaknesses of human nature upon us, and with our natural proneness to sin, can we expect to die in a state of heavenly purity? It would be presumption to think of so doing. Sin, and the consequences of it, are not so easily cleansed from our souls.—

There must be a middle state, a state of purgation from those lesser offences and imperfections, which have passed unheeded and unrepented of; a state of satisfaction, but always through the merits of our Saviour, for the debt of temporal punishment due to our more grievous offences, after their guilt has been remitted by the Sacrament of Penance. For

we remain faithful to her or not, she will still continue from one generation to another, the great parent of Christianity, the great city and empire of God. Should we have the baseness to desert her, we should only brand our race with apostacy; we should be lopped off as a withered and lifeless branch; while that gigantic tree, whose roots overspread the earth, and whose summits ascend into the very heavens, would equally continue to flourish and to fructify to the end of time.

^(u) *Rev.* xxi. 27. ^(x) *Psal.* cxlii. 2. ^(y) *St. Matt.* xii. 36.

who shall say that his repentance is so perfect as not only to cancel the guilt of sin, but even to make atonement for all the penalties due to his transgressions?

Who will not tremble for the future atonement to be required of him, when he remembers that Moses himself, the chosen servant of God, was prohibited from conducting the people of Israel into the land of promise, in punishment of his disbelief at the rock of Cades, though he still retained the favour of the Almighty? Who shall say, that having sinned like David, and repented like David, he shall be more deserving than that great monarch, and exempt from the punishment which the royal penitent nevertheless received? Though this punishment may befall us in this life, it must of necessity be more generally inflicted on us in the next. For it is but too obvious, that our failings and imperfections, generally at least, continue with us to the end; and if we fail and are imperfect to the last, how much less can we expect that the penal atonement for our former and more grievous offences, was ever completed in us. Instead of leading to despondency, it is a doctrine the most consoling. Is it not consoling to reflect, that though we pass imperfect through the trials and tribulations of the world, the divine mercy and goodness will still permit us to satisfy in another life, for our deficiencies in this? At the same time it

tempts us not to presume, for in no way do we hold the pains of purgatory to be a substitute for the torments of hell. They are of quite an opposite nature ; the pains of purgatory cleanse us from our smaller offences ; the flames of hell feed for ever upon our greater and more heinous sins. We all offend in many things, and *if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.*^(z) Hence the necessity of a purgatory, for *nothing defiled can enter heaven ;*^(a) and hence also, an end of that presumption, which would teach us to believe, that we stand like angels pure in the sight of God ; holy, without spot or blemish. We must hope that we do not deserve *to be cut down and cast into the fire,*^(b) but may we, therefore, deem ourselves worthy to enter immediately upon *our eternal weight of glory.*^(c) We must hope, that we are not *to suffer eternal punishment in destruction,*^(d) but, without further purgation, do we merit *to see the face of the Lord, and partake of the glory of his power ?*^(e) If he is not to be condemned by the wrath of God to *that place of fire and brimstone, where the smoke of his torments shall ascend for ever and ever ;*^(f) yet who shall be warranted in saying, he is *that*

(z) *St. John*, i. 8. (a) *Rev.* xxi. 4-6-8. (b) *St. Matt.* iii. 10.

(c) *2 Cor.* xiv. 17. (d) *2 Thess.* i. 9. (e) *Ibid.* i. 9.

(f) *Apoc.* xiv. 10, 11.

*wise and faithful servant, whom the Lord shall forthwith appoint over all his goods ?^(g) Should reasoning by analogy, and the authority and evidence of tradition, not prove sufficient to convince us of the existence of a middle state of suffering, the words of the Old Testament are decisive on the point, where it is related; That *Judas the valiant commander, sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead; for that it was a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they might be loosed from their sins.*^(h) and in the New Testament, this purgation from our lesser offences after death, is clearly described, where it is said; *If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.*⁽ⁱ⁾ (1 Cor. iii. 15.)*

^(g) St. Matt. xxiv. 45, 47. ^(h) 2 Machab. xii. 43, 44, 45, 46.

⁽ⁱ⁾ "For Christ, who had once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, (that he might bring us to God) being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which also, he went and preached unto the spirits in prison: which, sometime, were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20.)

"From this text, it appears, that at the time of our Saviour's death, there were some souls in a state of suffering (*in prison*) in the other world, on account of lesser sins,

In the *Sixth* place,—I cannot conform to Protestantism, because it is a religion only for the

not deserving of damnation; for, certainly, our Saviour would not have gone and *preached to them*, had they not been capable of salvation. These souls, therefore, were not in Heaven, where all preaching is needless, nor in hell, where all preaching is unprofitable; but *in the middle state of suffering souls*, which is the *purgatory* maintained by Roman Catholics.”—(See *The Protestant's Trial by the written Word*, p. 76.

Many Protestant divines have believed and advocated the Catholic doctrines on these points; amongst others, Dr. Forbes and Dr. Taylor, from whom I cite the two following passages: “Let not the old practice of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the whole Christian world, and the whole church, almost from the times of the apostles, be any longer rejected by Protestants, as unlawful, or vain. Let us respect the judgment of the primitive church, observing in public this rite as lawful, profitable, and approved by the church universal, which has ever believed this practice not only lawful, but profitable to the faithful departed.”—(Bishop Forbes's *Discourse on Purgatory*.) “Nay,” says Dr. Taylor, “we find, by the history of the Maccabees, the Jews did pray, and make offerings for the dead. Now, it is very considerable, that, since our Saviour did reprove all their evil doctrines, practices and traditions, and did argue concerning the dead, and the resurrection, yet he spoke no word against this practice, but left it as he found it, which he, who came to declare to us the will of his Father, would not have done, had it not been innocent, pious, and

learned and the rich, and to which the lowly and the illiterate cannot in reason belong. No one, who cannot read, can deduce his creed from the only Protestant rule of faith, the Sacred Writings, and thus take advantage of the licence of his Protestant principles, the licence of private interpretation. As a Protestant, he must either have no religious tenets at all, or he must take them at second hand from the lips of his pastor. Now, can any one be so far removed from the dictates of common prudence or common sense, as to adopt implicitly, without hesitation or doubt, and as the faith on which he is to rest his hopes of salvation, the opinions of a man, who acknowledges no authority to guide him but his own judgment ;

full of charity. The practice of it was at first and universal, it being plain in Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, and is still the doctrine and practice of the Jews.”—(Taylor’s *Liberty of Prophesying*, No. II. p. 345.)

Dr. Montague, bishop of Norwich, also held similar opinions : “ Though there be no third place,” says he, “ mentioned in the scriptures, yet it would not follow that there is no such place ; because, *there are many things which are not expressed in scripture* : as to those texts which seem to restrain the state of souls departed to Heaven, or hell, such are to be understood of the *final* state, after the day of general judgment ; when there will, according to all sides, remain but two everlasting states, viz, Heaven and Hell.—(*Appar.* p. 135.)

whose creed is neither watched nor regulated by any superior power ; and who has no more than a common right with himself to interpret the doctrines of Scripture ? If he is not satisfied with his own pastor, he goes to another, and is puzzled with the difference of his doctrine : he sees a champion for methodism in one pulpit, and an orthodox member of the church of England in another ; he becomes perplexed ; he has no means of extricating himself from his difficulties ;—he goes to the meeting-house, where he either finds an enthusiast, or a knave, crafty enough to *make merchandise of him*,^(k) by the apparent vehemence of his zeal ; or confounded by the absurdity and folly of the doctrines which he hears, he becomes an unbeliever ; and, probably, in the end, degenerates into a pest to society. And how can it be otherwise ? He sees nothing to command his confidence, and without confidence he can have no fixed and steadfast faith, and must needs *walk in darkness, and know not whither he goeth*.^(l)

^(k) 2 St. Peter, ii. 1-3. *But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction.—And through covetousness shall they, with feigned words, make merchandise of you ; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their perdition slumbereth not.*

^(l) St. John, xii. 35.

It is far different with the Catholic ; to him indeed *the ways of God are so straight that even fools shall not err therein ;*^(m) the most lowly, the most illiterate, and the most busily employed, may be as firm and sincere in their faith as those who have both ability to read, leisure to discuss, and capacity to understand. They willingly take the preacher's word for the doctrine which he inculcates, because they have confidence in it's orthodoxy. They know if it were unsound, that he would be immediately displaced ; he is the authorized organ of the Catholic church, and as such they bow submission to him. Were they addressed by St. Peter himself, they would not believe him with a firmer faith.⁽ⁿ⁾ A man must be a controvertist to be a protestant ; he has only to be an humble disciple of Christ to be a catholic : and when once a catholic, he is fixed in unfailing

^(m) *Isai.* xxxv. 8.

⁽ⁿ⁾ St. Paul says, " Faith comes by *hearing* ; and it was the custom during the earliest ages of the Church, to convey all religious instruction *viva voce*. It was many centuries before any written catechism was adopted ; and, generally speaking, the scriptures were read and explained publicly, and not privately. The people knew *from whom they learnt their doctrines*, and who had *sent* them their pastors : so far were they from adopting the licence of private interpretation, or listening to unauthorized teachers. If any did so, they were immediately rejected from the society of the true followers of the gospel.

security ; *The true religion is built upon a rock ; the rest are tossed upon the waves of time.*^(o)

Lastly : — I cannot conform to Protestantism, because, when I reflect how necessary, even in health and prosperity, are the consolations of religion, of the religion of *the God of all comfort* ;^(p) I cannot but experience a melancholy dread of being bereft of it's cheering influence when oppressed by trouble, or languishing on the bed of sickness, or of death. *Come to me all you that labour and are burthened, and I will refresh you,*^(q) is an invitation of the kind and benevolent Jesus, the most applicable to the professors of that religion which abounds most in consolation ; which affords us a more intimate intercourse with our spiritual pastors, and more copious means of applying the merits of our Redeemer to our souls. If our conscience be loaded with the guilt of sin, in the sorrow of our hearts we apply to our pastors, and find a remedy for our troubles in sacramental confession. There the fever of the soul is assuaged, the pangs of remorse are quieted, and iniquity is washed away, because by an act of obedience—of humiliation—of sincere repentance for our transgressions—joined with a sincere purpose of amendment for the future, she is reconciled

^(o) Lord Bacon. ^(p) 2 Cor. i. 3.

^(q) St. Matt. xi. 28.

with her Creator. The confession of our sins may be repulsive in theory, but it is most consoling in practice. It is also a strong argument in favor of this doctrine of the Catholic Church, that, however benign its influence and soothing its effects, it is yet so contrary to the inclinations of man, and so opposite to our nature, that it is impossible to have been of human institution. If, again, our troubles arise, not from the pressure of any particular criminality on the conscience, but from some of the melancholy list of misfortunes incidental to mankind, we still have recourse to our pastors. We are healed of our lesser offences and imperfections, by the sacrament of penance; we receive comfort from the advice of our spiritual director, and having thus PROVED *ourselves*,^(p) we venture to the great sacrament of grace, *the communion of the body and the blood of Christ*.^(q) Does Protestantism provide us with such a refuge in our necessities, such manifold sources of consolation in our troubles?

But it is upon the bed of sickness, and of death, that the superior comforts of our religion are the most striking. It is a lamentable truth, that the Protestant clergyman is but seldom found by the couch of the dying Christian: he is but rarely sent for, and seldom comes; and if he does make

(p) 1 Cor. xi. 2.

(q) 1 Cor. x. 16.

his appearance, it is only to hurry over a few prayers, and escape from the distressing scene. In cases of fever and contagion, they will not, perhaps, in consideration of their families, they cannot attend. ^(r) But where is the Catholic, however poor and forlorn, dying within reach of a clergyman of his own communion, who does not receive both the benefits and the consolations of his religion? Where is the pastor who shrinks from the functions of his ministry, from fear of taking the disease with which his penitent is afflicted, and of paying the forfeit of his life in the cause of charity? Where is the cabin so wretched that does not find him a ready inmate—the being so destitute, to whom he is not a willing and a faithful friend—the malady so loathsome or infectious, as to drive the messenger of *the God of all comfort* from the performance of his duty? It is not from one solitary visit that the penitent sinner, or the just man, derives consolation, (for even the just man requires consolation when the terrors of death are upon him,) but from a series of unremitting attentions during the whole course of his disorder.

Nor is it by mere exhortation and prayer that the contrition of the dying man is excited, his con-

^(r) This single circumstance pleads more eloquently for the celibacy of the clergy, than a whole volume upon the subject could possibly do.

science calmed, and his hopes elated, but by the seasonable administration of the sacraments of Penance, the Eucharist, and Extreme Unction. *Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him. Confess therefore your sins one to another.*^(s) The Protestant Liturgy formerly contained these injunctions equally with the Catholic.^(t)

(s) *St. James*, v. 15, 15, 16.

(t) If in this discussion I have asserted any thing concerning the Establishment, which is not founded in fact, I am willing to stand corrected: I have relied upon the best information that came within my reach, and any misapprehension into which I may have fallen, will, I hope, be admitted as an unintentional error.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

HAVING thus shortly attempted to detail some of the reasons which govern Catholics in their non-conformity to Protestantism, and serve to attach them so firmly to their own faith; I beg the indulgence of my readers for a moment, whilst I offer a few desultory observations, intimately connected with, and naturally arising from, the subject of the foregoing pages. Of the importance of religious controversy, I need say nothing. All who believe in Revelation, all who value the morality of the Gospel, all who ground the hope of their salvation upon the doctrine of our Redeemer, must acknowledge the necessity of a firm, a lively, and a *steadfast* faith.^(a) This being the case, and since it is the misfortune of Christendom to be harrassed and divided by such a variety of religious creeds, out of which we are bound to adopt ONE as the only true one, the utility and necessity of polemic controversy appears to be incontestably established. So long as there

^(a) 2 St. Pet. iii. 17.

are *false prophets and lying teachers among the people* ;^(b) so long as *we should always be ready to give an answer to every man that asketh us, a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness* ;^(c) so long as it is necessary to distinguish *the spirit of truth from the spirit of error* :^(d) so long, also, will religious controversy be necessary to furnish us with a knowledge of the points in dispute, and for the defence and the confirmation of our faith.^(e) I must apologize for again reverting to

(b) 2 St. Pet. ii. 1. (c) 1 St. Pet. iii. 15. (d) St. John, iv. 6.

(e) If the Protestant practice in cases of divorce, were the only instance of a violation of the morality of the gospel on the part of the Reformers, it would of itself be amply sufficient to justify a continual controversial discussion. If divorce is attempted to be justified by the *letter* of the gospel, the letter of the gospel will be discovered to be diametrically opposed to it ; and if an appeal be made to the spirit of the gospel, that spirit will rise up in judgment against it. The solitary text of scripture upon which it is so vaguely attempted to justify divorce, is susceptible of a very different interpretation from what Protestants endeavour to impose upon it. The corresponding passages in St. Mark (xii), St. Luke (xvi. 18), St. Paul (*Cor.* vii. 10.), and even in St. Matt. himself (v. 32.), most unequivocally point out the manner in which we are to understand it, namely, that *whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting for the cause of fornication, committeth adultery ; and whosoever shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery*. If not, the sa-

the subject of misrepresentation ; but it is the most cruel and the most successful weapon which our

cred penmen are all at variance and in contradiction with each other ; and the positive injunction of our Saviour, *What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder*, (*St. Mark* x. 9.) is a false and nugatory precept. It was even in the very act of abrogating the ancient law of divorce, that these words were pronounced ; and instead of permitting divorces upon any terms, the object was to do away with them altogether. But to revert to the text of *St. Matthew*, since without any contortion it will bear the interpretation which the Catholic church affixes to it, and which *St. Matthew* himself has clearly given it in another passage (*Chap.* v. 32.) ;—and since we know, by incontrovertible historical evidence, that it was understood in that sense during the earliest ages of the church, there is an end to the argument of scripture authority being in favour of divorces. So far for the literal interpretation of this text ; as to the spirit of it, there is no passage in the sacred writings, the misinterpretation of which is of more serious and permanent detriment to domestic happiness and morality, than this. How many would restrain their passions, were it not for the previous knowledge that those passions may in the end be legally indulged. Is it not an incentive to adultery to know that it may be pursued almost with impunity ? Is it not a temptation to every species of villainy and hypocrisy, to be aware that the sacred bond of matrimony may, at any time, be broken asunder, and transferred to another object ? It is this state of things, which has occasioned in this country violations of the laws of matrimony, that have made us the scorn and contempt of every civilized people in the world.

enemies employ against us. It is, however, a signal triumph to us, that none can ever attack Catholicity, without first enlisting falsehood and

The divorces which take place yearly, not to say monthly, in the British empire, (though, thank heaven, they are not yet become the law of the land) are an infringement upon every law both human and divine, ecclesiastical and civil. I have already shown that they stand in opposition to the law of God; they are also prohibited by our civil code, which recognizes only a separation *a mensâ et a thoró*; they are also contrary to our ecclesiastical law, which permits no more (both being the laws of ancient Catholic times); and it is necessary to call on the omnipotent power of a British parliament, which arrogates to itself a superiority over every power in the world, to break down all the fences which reason, law, and revelation have united to erect for the security of domestic life, and the durability of the sacred vows of matrimony. As to the regulations respecting divorces, and the facilities afforded them in Scotland, they would almost disgrace a tribe of savage Indians.

As in every thing else that is the offspring of Protestantism, there is so much inconsistency in the principles and the laws of divorce, as to render the whole system a complete paradox. The bishops in their own courts acknowledge no such practice; but the bishops in the House of Lords lend their sanction to them. The trial of the late Queen is a striking instance of the incalculable evils of such a system; it may with truth be said, that a more disgraceful scene was never exhibited in any Christian country.

calumny into their cause. That religion must, indeed, be in itself invulnerable, which obliges her opponents to forge a new creed for her adoption, before they can hope to make any impression upon her ; which, having no blemish of its own, compels malice to seek her gratification at the expence of truth, to surround her with ideal forms, and then, with hypocritical knavery, to exert all her might to destroy the wicked phantoms of her own creation. But so it was, from the commencement of Christianity, and so it will be, to the end. The primitive Christians, and the Catholics of the present day, are severally accused of the same crimes, and subject to the same calumnies. The reverential honour in which the primitive Christians held the cross, was divine worship to images ; their miracles, were magical enchantments ; their loyalty to Christ, was treason to the state ; their adoration of the One Eternal Author of all things, was atheism and infidelity to the gods.^(f) To such an extent has misre-

^(f) Both in pagan and in christian times, the cry of disloyalty and treason has ever been the signal for the most atrocious crimes, the war-whoop against virtue and religion. Socrates, perhaps the most virtuous Athenian that ever lived, was condemned to death, for teaching that immortal truth, the unity of the Godhead : and his crime was called disloyalty to the state, because it was treason to its religion. It was disloyalty, always imputed, but never proved, that raised the cry of *ad Leones*, against the primitive Chris-

presentation been carried, that it would be no very bold defiance to stand pledged to discover a false-

tians, and that has continued *to shed the blood of prophets and of saints*, in every age, and in every nation, that has been darkened with the spirit of bigotry, and stained with the horrors of persecution. "It was the imputation of disloyalty to Cæsar, which led St. Paul to prison, and condemned our Saviour to the cross! It is a proud and honorable distinction, that our loyalty to God, the King of kings, our eternal prince, and supreme ruler, should bear the dishonorable title of disloyalty to our temporal sovereign, and treason to the constitution." *Blessed are they who suffer persecution for justice sake. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you, UNTRULY, for my sake. It is enough for the disciple to be as his master; if they have called the master of the house, Beelzebub, how much more them of his household!*

The Almighty has said, through the mouth of an inspired teacher: *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers: for there is no power but from God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist purchase to themselves damnation.* And again, *Thou shalt not speak evil of the prince of thy people.* Hence, in serving and honoring our king, we serve and honor our God; and it is a most extraordinary expedient to make us more faithful to our prince, by endeavouring to make us unfaithful to our Creator: which, most undoubtedly, we should be, did we subscribe to the Test now required of us. We must ever remember that while 'we give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' we must also 'give to God the things that are God's.'

hood in the very first argument of every book that has come from the pen of our adversaries. *They stand about us objecting many and grievous accusations, which they cannot prove.*^(g) As far as

(g) Acts, xxv. 7. Unless it were to shew the furious extremities to which our enemies allow themselves to be carried, it would be beneath a Catholic to notice that crowd of abominable and impious tracts, which, at this moment, are so widely and so industriously circulated amongst the poor and the ignorant of this country, and that, too, by members of the established church, with the absurd intent of proving that the pope is Antichrist. I allude to them principally for the purpose of replying to them, in the eloquent words of Dr. Doyle: "To such extremities did these men proceed, as not only to confound the power claimed by some few popes of Rome, over the temporal interests or rights of kings and kingdoms, with the spiritual jurisdiction of St. Peter's successor, but, in addition to this misrepresentation, they actually designated, not one or other, but a whole series of those successors, as Antichrists, and excited the deluded multitude to hate them, and curse them, as the capital enemies of our Lord and Saviour. Yes, the very men, who maintained from the beginning, and still maintain, against an infidel or Arian world, the divinity of the son of God, the very men who designate themselves as the last of his servants, and who, without any doubt, have caused his name to be published and adored throughout nearly the whole Christian world, these men, who never ask anything of the Father except through the Son, and identify him in their daily prayers with the King of ages, the immortal and invisible

regards us, it is bad policy, for it does but confirm the Catholic in his faith, to find it so invulnerable; and to those who are sincere in the pursuit of truth, the exposure of such deception frequently forms a strong inducement to their conversion. But, among the weak and the timid, among those who have little leisure, and perhaps less opportunity for examining the question, it does much mischief. It blackens us in the eyes of many, who are otherwise inclined to look favourably upon us, and makes them turn away in disgust from that investigation, which, in justice to themselves, they are bound to go through—an investigation which would terminate so much to *our* honour and to *their* satisfaction. To what other possible circumstances can the following rebuke of our Saviour to the Pharisees be more applicable? *Woe to you, doctors of the law, for you have taken away the key of knowledge; you yourselves have not entered in, and those that were entering in you have hindered.*^(h)

God to whom alone all are due, and given, all honor and glory,—these very men have been called, by the ferocious leaders of the revolt, ‘Antichrists’ and the Church in which they have always presided, and whose faith was from the beginning, and is still spoken of throughout the entire world,—this Church they called ‘Babylon,’ and the ‘great apostacy,’ with all manner of opprobrious and insulting names.”—*Reply to Magee*, p. 42.

^(h) *St. Luke*, xi. 52.

That no one into whose hands these pages may chance to fall, may henceforward unknowingly subject himself to a similar denunciation, and that none may in future plead ignorance for their errors or their prejudices, I have annexed to this volume a copious list of Catholic controversial writings.⁽ⁱ⁾ Almost any one of them is sufficient to satisfy an impartial mind, a mind seriously and sincerely engaged in the pursuit of truth. Let them be considered as counterparts to the writings of our adversaries; let them be consulted as mirrors, in which our principles and our doctrines are reflected in their true light. They will remove that dismal mask from the fair face of our religion, first imposed upon it by the malice of its enemies, and afterwards continued by the ignorance and credulity of mankind. They will exhibit it as it really is, pure, holy, spotless, and undefiled.

There is another point on which we feel particularly jealous, because we are particularly innocent; namely, BIGOTRY. If by bigotry is meant a blind and ignorant attachment to our tenets, we plead *not guilty*, upon the credit of this single fact, that for one Protestant who can give any sort of plausible *reason for the hope which is in him*,^(k) there are at least ten Catholics, who will produce strong and solid arguments in defence of their

⁽ⁱ⁾ See APPENDIX. No. VI.

^(k) 1 St. Pet. iii. 15.

creed.⁽¹⁾ But if by bigotry is meant an uncharitable, illiberal, and sweeping condemnation of all who differ from us in belief, it is certainly no difficult matter to prove ourselves not only far less bigoted than any of our accusers, but indeed altogether exempt from the charge.

In the second chapter of an excellent work entitled "Charity and Truth," first published many years ago, and recently republished under the sanction of the venerable prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, a work most deservedly held in the highest estimation among us, the following positions are to be found:—1st. That whatever be the religious belief of the parents of a person who is baptized, and whatever be the faith of the person who baptizes him, he becomes, in the instant of his baptism, a member of the Catholic church, as the true church of Christ.—2ndly. That he receives in his baptism justifying grace, and justifying faith.—3dly. That he loses the former by the commission of any mortal sin.—4thly. That he loses the latter by the commission of a mortal sin against faith; but does not lose it by the commission of any mortal sin of any other

⁽¹⁾ It stands to reason that a Catholic should be better instructed in matters of religion than a Protestant, since all our Catechisms, and Books of Devotion, contain a vast deal more information both on faith and morals, than any that are in use among Protestants.

kind.—5thly. That without such wilful ignorance, or wilful error, as amounts to a crime in the eyes of God, a mortal sin against faith is never committed: and 6thly. That, except in an extreme case, no individual is justified in imputing, even in his own mind, this criminal ignorance or criminal error to any other individual.—From an admirable sermon on UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE, delivered by an eminent Roman Catholic preacher,^(m) in the year 1816, both in Bath and London, and which has been published and widely circulated under the authority of the Vicars Apostolic of this country, the following passage is extracted:—"Never be so uncharitable and so gross, as indiscriminately to give the harsh and odious appellation of *Heretics* to all those who belong not to our communion."⁽ⁿ⁾ That word implies *guilt* as well as *error*.

^(m) The Rev. Dr. Archer.

⁽ⁿ⁾ That such have always been the sentiments of the brightest luminaries of the Catholic Church, the following passages from St. Augustin will tend to show: 'The apostle Paul,' says this great man, in his one hundred and sixty-second letter, 'has said, *an heretical man, after one reproof, avoid*; knowing, that he who is of this sort is subverted and sins, and is self-condemned; but they who defend not with an obstinate animosity, their own opinion, though false and perverse, especially if it be an opinion which they did not originate in the assurance of their own presumption, but which they received from their parents, seduced and fallen into error, and who, seeking the truth with a cautious solicitude, are ready on finding

You have been taught in your catechisms, that heresy is an *obstinate* error in matters of faith.

it, to be corrected, they are not by any means to be reputed among heretics.'—*Reply to Dr. Magee.*

Let us hear Dr. Doyle himself: "It was a question," says he, "amongst the Jews, what was the greatest commandment in the law, whether to worship the Deity by sacrifice, which was a profession of faith—of absolute dependance on the Supreme Being, and an act of prayer, or to love him with the whole heart. The Redeemer decided the question in favor of the love of God, and of our neighbour; and St. Paul, having enumerated faith, hope, and charity, the three great christian virtues, says, expressly, that charity, which lasts for ever, is the greatest of the three. Sins, therefore, against faith, such as heresy, are very grievous; perhaps, next to apostacy, this vice is the worst of all, as it cuts up the roots of justification; but, abstracting from this character of it, it may not be so malicious, not so much opposed to the nature of God, as those sins which conflict with charity;—and this is a reflection which ought often to occur to those, who, agitated by a fiery zeal, and swoln with a selfishness, which they mistake for faith, break down all the charities of human life, sow dissensions amongst brethren, and totally forget the divine command of doing to others what they would that others should do to them. We should reprobate heresy as we reprove drunkenness or theft, usury or oppression of the poor; we should denounce schism as we proclaim the guilt of calumny or detraction; but as we should exercise patience and long suffering towards the drunkard, the thief, or the calumniator, so we should use forbearance

He *only* is a *heretic*, who, when he has discovered truth, wilfully and perversely, from human re-

and charity towards the wilful and obstinate heretic, hoping that the Lord may, perhaps, yet give him repentance, like to other sinners. But, if the person who is in error, has been seduced into it by others, if he have received it as an inheritance from his fathers, and if his education, his habits, his passions, his interests, his connexions, raise a barrier about him, which the light of truth cannot, morally speaking, penetrate, or the force of argument approach, still less break down; to cherish for such a person any other feeling than that of the most unmixed and ardent charity, would not only be unchristian, but inhuman; to consign such a man to future suffering, on account of his errors, would be an usurpation of the divine knowledge and power, and whosoever should pass judgment on him, should fear that a similar judgment, without mercy, would be passed upon himself. It is the duty of those who are ministers of Christ, to exhibit the truths of the gospel, and the errors opposed to them, to display virtue in all her beauty, and exhibit also the deformity of vice; to exhort and beseech men in all patience and doctrine, to adhere to truth and virtue, and to fly from vice and error; to minister the aids of religion to all who seek them at their hands; to exclude from their assemblies and communion all who obstinately adhere to vice or error, but to leave the judgment of men's souls to Him who created and redeemed them, who alone is able to discern the innocent from the guilty, and who will repay to every one according to what he did in the body, whether good or evil.

spects, for worldly interests, or some such unworthy object, shuts his mind against it; or who obstinately or negligently refuses to be at the pains necessary for discovering it; and how can you presume to pronounce of any individual man, that this is his case, unless he acknowledge it? Can you assert that the doctrine which *you know* to be true, has been proposed to him in such a light of evidence, as to give conviction to his mind; or that he is not so satisfied with his own creed, as to preclude every idea of an obligation to make further inquiry? Those who carefully seek the truth, and sincerely follow the best light they can obtain in their respective circumstances, are innocent in the sight of God, and secure of his acceptance, whatever may be the errors into which they involuntarily fall. *Who art thou,*

“ There is no person who rightly understands the spirit in which Christians are called, and which spirit created and preserved that unity amongst the members of the church, who will not subscribe to those sentiments. They are the dictate of charity and liberality, rightly understood; but far removed, certainly, from that novel opinion now so prevalent amongst Protestants, which would open the church to all sorts and descriptions of sects, and erase from the catalogue of vices, revealed to us by Almighty God, the crimes of heresy and schism.”—*Reply to Dr. Magee.*

then, *that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.*"^(o)

Again, in a most learned, temperate, and conciliatory work, from the pen of an eminent French divine, (now Archbishop of Strasbourg,) we find the following note:—"What shall we say of that multitude of Protestants who daily die without confession, without even knowing that it was ordained by Jesus Christ for the remission of sin? A firm faith, and involuntary and insurmountable error, are powerful titles to the divine mercy, and may obtain from heaven that disposition of mind which would induce us to fly with eagerness to the tribunal of confession, if we were only aware of its necessity. This species of implicit desire—this indirect, though blind preparation—this wish, though ill expressed, yet comprehended by an omniscient God, joined to a lively repentance and a perfect charity, may, it is true, supply the place of the actual confession of our sins."^(p)

^(o) *Rom. xiv. 4.*

^(p) *Discussion Amicale*, vol. ii. p. 178. London, 1817.—The passage continues as follows: "We fondly wish to suppose this high degree of contrition and of love in all those who die without the assistance and the graces of the sacrament; but, unfortunately, we cannot dissemble to ourselves, and must fear that it is rarely to be found, though it is the only resource with which we are acquainted, even for excusable ignorance."

It would be useless to swell these pages with numberless other quotations in proof of the charitable and liberal interpretations of our exclusive doctrine, since the most sceptical must acknowledge, that sufficient has been advanced to expose the mistake of those who accuse Catholics in general of bigoted and uncharitable tenets. But if there be any individuals amongst us whose outrageous zeal might induce them to entertain opinions on these points, which their creed neither obliges nor authorizes them to hold, let not those opinions be imputed to the whole body.—The bare dogmatical tenet, that “out of the Catholic church there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation,” unaccompanied by any explanation, and which is so to be found both in our formularies of faith and in the writings of our most able and most liberal controvertists, might, at first sight, appear to warrant the charge of bigotry against us. But when it is considered that in the application of this doctrine we always hold those only to be heretics who *wilfully* believe or *obstinately* profess errors in matters of faith;—that, in declaring the Protestant religion to be a heresy, we do not condemn its professors as heretics,^(g) (“which

^(g) We do not say, You are a Protestant, and therefore a heretic, and, consequently, have no chance of salvation; we only say (and it is the doctrine which we all learn in our catechism) that he *only* is a heretic who *wilfully* believes or *obstinately* professes errors in matters of faith.

appellation implies *guilt* as well as *error*");—that we leave the *guilt* of every individual between his God and himself;—that we count all within the pale of Catholic unity, who do not perversely refuse to enter it;—and lastly, that the Church contents herself with the simple declaration, that “wilful heresy is deserving of condemnation;”—there is surely clear and ample evidence on which to acquit us of bigotry and illiberality.

It now remains to be seen if we cannot more justly charge our adversaries with that, of which I trust it now fully appears, they have most unjustly accused us. Protestants, as well as Catholics, hold the Athanasian Creed, which says, “that unless a man doth keep entire and inviolate the Catholic faith, without doubt, he shall perish everlastingly.” We have collected the meaning and interpretation attached, by us, to this dogma; let us see if the doctrine of any of the Protestant Churches will give them an equal right to so charitable an explanation. The eighteenth article of the Established Church is couched in the following harsh terms: “They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light

So that when the church pronounces judgment against heretics, she always pre-supposes that they have a *knowledge* of their errors, but have not the *will* to correct them.

of nature." The Protestant Church of Scotland holds, that out of *their* Church, "there is neither life nor eternal felicity to be hoped for, and that it is blasphemy to affirm, that men who live according to equity and justice shall be saved, in whatever religion they may have lived."—The Protestant Church of France propounds in her catechism: "that no one obtains pardon of his sins, who is not incorporated with the people of God, and the *unity* of *their* Church, out of which there is nothing but death and damnation."—How the Roman Catholic Church can be accused of bigotry and illiberality, by men who profess tenets like these, I am at a loss to understand; and how the excluding doctrine, couched in such harsh and forbidding terms, can possibly be susceptible of the same charitable interpretation which we give to our declaration, "that out of the Catholic Church there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation," it is equally difficult to imagine. Still, among the many inconsistencies of Protestant belief, many of her most learned Divines have admitted, that we can be saved *by* the faith of the Catholic Church, since all points necessary for salvation are contained in that faith.^(r) The Protestant Divines of the university

(r) See the third chapter of *The Faith and Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, proved by the Testimony of the most learned Protestants, &c.* 1813. Keating, Brown, and Keating.

of Helmstadt decided, in 1708, that Catholics are not in fundamental errors, and such as are opposite to salvation:⁽⁴⁾ thus disowning the exclusive doctrine altogether, and virtually making a renunciation of Protestantism; for, as the Catholic Church is the parent stock from which all other sects and religions are derived, by what arguments can she defend her separation, if she admit that every necessary truth, nothing opposed to salvation is taught and practised by it? *I am the true vine*, says our Saviour, *and my Father is the husbandman....As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine; so neither can you, unless you abide in me.* By your act of unjustifiable separation, you have ceased to abide in me....you are cast forth as a branch, and shall wither.⁽⁵⁾—These strange inconsistencies produce strange dilemmas. If Protestants reject the excluding doctrine altogether, they surrender the principles upon which they separated from the Church of Rome; if they maintain it, according to their authenticated tenets, they stand

⁽⁴⁾ Whoever is curious to examine the motives for this candid and liberal decision, may find them detailed at length at the end of a little pamphlet, entitled: *The Duke of Brunswick's Fifty Reasons for abjuring Lutheranism, and embracing the Roman Catholic Religion*; to be had of all Catholic booksellers.

⁽⁵⁾ *St. John*, xv. 1. & 4.

justly convicted, by their own evidence, of that illiberality for which they so unjustly condemn us.^(u)

Having already trespassed too long upon the patience of my readers, I will very shortly take my leave of them. If these *Reasons* should fortunately so far influence the minds of any, as to induce them to enter more at large upon the inquiry into their moral conduct and religious creed, an inquiry the most important of all that can occupy the attention of man, it is much of what I desire. As conciliation and union, founded upon truth and justice, is my object, I will venture once more to express a hope that what I have said will give offence to none. If I have failed in convincing, I trust, at least, that I have confirmed none in their errors; that if I have not brightened, at least, I have not extinguished the lamp of truth; and, above all, that I have not violated the strictest bounds of Christian charity. Let me exhort those who enter upon the discussion of religious controversy, to bring with them an humble and a docile

^(u) The following definitions of bigotry and illiberality, will clearly show to which party those epithets most properly belong. The Bigot is he who is blindly and passionately wedded to an opinion, for which he can neither show the authority of God nor the force of reason. The Illiberal Man is he who refuses to another the right of exercising his understanding where God has left him free.

mind, a mind disposed and desirous to be instructed, ready to subject their reason to *the obedience of faith*;^(x) not with a determination to perpetuate their prejudices, and cherish their incredulity. There is nothing we should guard against more than an "ignorance, unwilling to be informed, and an obstinacy, resolving not to be convinced." In the prosecution of this inquiry, let us candidly ask ourselves, if we are seriously and sincerely engaged in the pursuit of truth; and if so, whether we are determined, at all hazards, to embrace it, when we have succeeded in discovering it? By this standard alone can we determine our sincerity, and satisfy our conscience that we are performing our duty.—If those who are in error will but fairly and candidly put their religion to the test, I answer for it they will discover it's falsehood; if, with the Bishop of Ephesus, in the Apocalypse, they will but *try those who say they are Apostles, and are not*;^(y) I will pledge my existence that they will find them *liars*.^(z) Controversy is the most simple and the most easy of all studies; it resolves itself into one question,—*The Infallibility of the true Church of Christ*. When once we have discovered this Church, and surely its characteristics are so marked that none can mistake them, then all we have to do is to bow, in humble submission, to her

(x) Rom. xvi. 26. (y) Apo. ii. 2. (z) Ibid.

doctrinal decisions.^(a) Let us, then, no longer suffer ourselves to be *tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine*; but, in accordance with the apostolic precept, listen to the authority of the Church; *we are of God; he that knoweth God, heareth us, he that is not of God, heareth us not: by this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.*^(b)

With this view let us also put the same question to ourselves, which Philip put to the Eunuch who was reading the Scriptures: *Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?* And if we answer in the same spirit, and with the same docility, *How can I, unless some man shew me?*^(c) no doubt we shall be rewarded with the same success. Though, in hearing the Church, we seem

^(a) As all must stand upon the basis of historical evidence, hence in discussing this or any other tenet or controverted point, it is surely the most natural method to refer, in the first instance, to the most ancient written evidence, namely, the Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church. If the Scriptures are not sufficiently full and satisfactory, we then go to those who followed nearest, in point of time, to the Apostles, and in whose writings we readily discover the sense in which the particular doctrine in question was understood in their days; from them it was handed down to the succeeding generation; and from thence we may trace it, always with an accumulating weight of testimony, to our own times.

^(b) 1 *Epist. St. John*, iv. 6. ^(c) *Acts*, viii. 30, 31.

to listen to men; yet it is not men who speak therein, but God who speaks, by the ministry of men. Let us then listen, with proper dispositions, and we shall find her wisdom and her spirit irresistible.^(d) It is thus, and thus only, that “the ignorant can be delivered from the seductions of false teachers, and the learned from the pride and delusion of false wisdom.”^(e)

Neither is it any reason for us to be satisfied, because, without diligent inquiry made with the necessary dispositions, we may feel already convinced. “They who allow their passions,”—and I will add, their prejudices, “to confound the distinctions between right and wrong, are criminal: they may be convinced, but they have not come honestly by their conviction.” They are in that state in which it is to be feared, that the Almighty *has sent them the operation of error to believe lying;*^(f) they are amongst those *unbelievers in whom the God of this world hath so blinded their minds, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not*

^(d) Acts, vi. 10.

^(e) Though error may be innocent because it may be sincere, yet there can be no sincerity without inquiry, nor any inquiry without a solicitude to discover the truth, and a determination to follow it when discovered.

^(f) 2 Thess. ii. 10.

shine unto them.⁽ⁱ⁾ They are suffered to be deceived, because they love deception: they are permitted to be confirmed in error, because they have been unwilling to behold and to embrace the truth. But if we wish to be preserved from such callous hearts and darkened understandings, let us, with the advice of the Apostle, *anoint our eyes that we may see*^(k) with sincerity and humility. Let us beseech the God of light to remove from us all blindness of heart: let us not forget that those who think themselves wise, may make themselves *fools*^(l) by the folly of their *own conceits*,^(m) by vanity, pride, or obstinacy: let us fervently pray, that *through the mercy of God, ... the orient from on high may visit us, may enlighten them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, and direct their feet in the ways of peace.*⁽ⁿ⁾ As we cannot be too strongly impressed with the necessity of such dispositions, I will again request the reader, in the words of a pious, an excellent and an amiable man, now no more, to bear in mind, “That candour and impartiality, necessary in all discussions, are particularly so where the passions are all engaged on one side; that truth must come from the *Father of light*; that it behoveth the sincere inquirer to remove the obsta-

⁽ⁱ⁾ 2 Cor. iv. 4.

^(k) Apoc. iii. 18.

^(l) Rom. i. 22.

^(m) Rom. xii. 16.

⁽ⁿ⁾ St. Luke, i. 78, 79.

cles which the ignorance and the pride of the human mind oppose to it; and, in fine, that only the pure of heart see God, and that into a malicious soul wisdom will not enter, nor dwell in a body subject unto sin."

If, in the course of the inquiry, we meet with that which it is impossible to comprehend, and difficult to believe, we must remember that the Almighty has so ordained it for the exercise of our faith; for *faith is the evidence of things that appear not.*^(o) We must equally adore in humility and silence, the revelations of God to man, and the inscrutable counsels of heaven in the government of the world; and we must apply to both, these words of the apostle, *O the depth of the riches, of the wisdom, and of the knowledge of God! how incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways.*^(p) If we cannot reduce every thing to the standard of human reason, nor to the narrow comprehension of our capacities, we must recollect that omniscience is an attribute not granted to man; that *we see now through a glass, and in a dark manner*; but the time will come when we shall see *face to face*: *now we know only in part, but then we shall know even as we are known.*^(q) We must be satisfied that every thing is in conformity with the inscru-

(o) *Heb. xi. 1.* (p) *Rom. xi. 33.* (q) *1 Cor. xiii. 12.*

table decrees of the wisdom of the Deity, because we know we are not to enter into judgment with God, nor call our Creator to account for his conduct towards his creatures. The God of all knowledge has revealed to us enough for the purposes of our salvation, and that is sufficient. *His* is the province to command, ours to obey; his counsels are righteous and his ways are unsearchable; and it is not for us to question the equity of his providence, nor penetrate the depths of his designs. He has taught us his holy will, and we must perform it with alacrity; not wait to discuss its utility, or question its propriety. Though in revelation there is much beyond reason, yet there is nothing contrary to it. It is only the 'sophisms of reasoning pride' that would lead us into contradiction and absurdity. Let us not lose ourselves in the intricate mazes of human speculation; but taking a straight-forward path, let us 'adhere firmly to the sacred laws of truth, of reason, and of revelation: of truth undisguised by fashionable error; of reason unbiassed by worldly motives; of revelation unsullied with the infectious breath of pretended reformation.'

In conclusion, let me call upon those who engage in polemic combat, to shake hands upon the field of battle and cleanse the venom from their weapons; we extract the sting from controversy, by discarding acrimonious invective and passionate

hostility. Freedom of discussion is necessary in the cause of truth; but that freedom must not be suffered to degenerate into licentiousness. As reason should be subject to revelation, so should zeal be obedient to charity; and though we differ in belief, we may live in harmony. Let it be our endeavour to promote the happiness of each other; and if we are not likely to concur in opinion upon all points, let us rejoice that we agree in many; and knowing with how much difficulty truth is sometimes found, let us not wonder that some should miss it. Whenever we are arrayed as adversaries, let it be under the banners of *'the meek and humble Jesus;'* and may the motto blazoned on them be that golden sentence of an eloquent Father of the Church: IN NECES- SARIIS UNITAS, IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS, ET IN OMNIBUS CHARITAS; and while we display our triumph, let us also learn to show our moderation. Thus will error be overthrown, the troubled passions be allayed, and the olive branch of peace proclaim that the waters of discord have subsided. May they never flow again, but be dried up in their sources, absorbed by CHARITY and TRUTH.

FINIS.

POSTSCRIPT.

IN offering to the reader the Traditionary Evidence of the Doctrines of our Church on the points to which it relates, contained in No. III. of the following APPENDIX, I beg leave to call his attention to a rule laid down by the Bishop of London, in his Charge of 1826 (*p.* 17). “When we are acquainted,” says he, “with the true state of the controversy, we may form our own conclusions: . . . and how is this to be done? Not, surely, by retaliating mis-statements, invectives, and calumnies, or *crudely asserting an unqualified right of private judgment*, but BY REFERENCE TO PRIMITIVE ANTIQUITY; disproving the allegations of our opponents from the *silence* of scripture, of general tradition, of ancient writers, which, in a case of this nature, is *decisive*; appealing to the proceedings of Emperors, *the acts of councils*, the *language of Fathers*, of Bishops, and even of Popes, which *contradict* the pretensions of the Papacy, &c....” *The genuine records of ancient usage and practice*, will, in like manner, supply us with *proof*, &c.”—Now, with all deference to the Rt. Rev. Prelate, we may surely be allowed to ask, what this *silent* evidence, to which he appeals, can weigh against the *positive* and *speaking* testimony

which we can produce? As to the *contradicting* evidence, except on the point to which his Lordship refers, it is no where to be found: and even on that point, it will be seen only to contradict, *not the lawful and spiritual authority of the Pontiff*, but the *pretensions* of the Papacy. To deduce *proof* from *the genuine records of ancient usage and practice*, is an admirable rule, and one by which every Catholic, in common with the Bishop, is ready to be judged. I trust I have shewn in another part of this work, that the *silence* of scripture is not *proof*. The *contradiction* of scripture certainly is: for, if a doctrine be *contrary* to scripture, it cannot be true. But till the scriptures can be proved to be *an independent rule of faith*, and to have been delivered to us in this capacity, which the Catholic Church has *always proved* NOT to have been the case, by *ancient usage and practice*,—the mere silence of scripture cannot be taken in evidence. And as to the *speaking* and *positive* testimony of the sacred writings, *this unerring rule of ancient usage and practice* will shew that the Church, and the Church alone, has ever been considered as the authorized expounder of it.

In evidence of this, I will here content myself with citing the sentiments of only one of those great and learned men, whom all Christendom has agreed to honour with the distinctive title of *Fa-*

thers of the Church. St. Irenæus, writing during the second century, observes :—

“ Paul says : ‘ God appointed in his church apostles, prophets, and doctors. Where, therefore, the holy gifts of God are, there must the truth be learned ; with them is the succession from the apostles, and there is the society whose communication is sound and irreproveable, unadulterated, and pure. These preserve the faith of one God, who made all things ; increase our love towards his divine Son, and expound, without danger, the scriptures to us, not blaspheming the name of God, nor dishonouring the patriarchs, nor contemning the prophets.’ (*Adversus Hæc. L. iv. c. 45. p. 345.*)—“ To him that believeth that there is one God, and holds to the head, which is Christ—to this man all things will be plain, if he read diligently the scriptures with the aid of those who are the priests in the church, and in whose hands, as we have shewn, rests the doctrine of the Apostles.” (*Ibid. c. 52. p. 355.*)

The infallibility of the Church of God, in expounding the scriptures, and delivering the doctrines of Christ, is the only question which our adversaries have any right to attack ; for till this point be carried, all others must remain invulnerable ; but it wears ‘ a panoply against which every arrow falls blunted to the ground.’ There is no proposition more true than this—that if a Catholic

be once separated from that great sheet anchor of his faith, the indefectibility of the Church of Christ, he is drifted as a mere wreck upon the waters, and, in point of religious belief, becomes as mutable as the waves, and as uncertain as the winds. "Where such are the pretensions advanced," *viz.* to infallibility, says the writer of the Charge to which I have alluded, "the truth or the falsehood of particular articles of faith becomes a secondary question. If Christ has appointed the Church of Rome the exclusive possessor of his promises, the sole depositary of his authority, the infallible judge in controversies regarding the faith, it is useless to debate on other matter. If this point is decided in her favour, our only resource is to acknowledge our errors, to sue for reconciliation, and accept the system of doctrines which is proved to be true by her sanction." (P. 16.) Now, *if this point be not decided in her favour* by the Bishop's own rule,—*the language of Fathers and of Bishops, and from the genuine records of ancient usage and practice*,—I pledge myself to desert her communion on the morrow.⁽⁷⁾

⁽⁷⁾ Any one who chooses may see the proofs in the work from which the following extracts are taken.—*The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first four Centuries of the Church.* Booker, 1812.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

SPEECH OF EDWARD BLOUNT, ESQ.

AT an Open Meeting of the General Committee of the British Catholic Association, held at their rooms, on Saturday, the 21st of July, 1827, Lord Stourton in the Chair,

MR. BLOUNT said,—I feel it my duty, as Secretary to this Association, and Chairman of that Committee whose peculiar province it is to repel unfounded calumnies upon our principles, to bespeak your attention for a few minutes. —On Friday, the 29th of last month, a General Public Meeting was held at the City of London Tavern, for the purpose of forming an Auxiliary Society in the City of London, to the British Society for promoting the religious principles of the Reformation. The Right Hon. Lord Farnham was in the Chair. The Hon. Granville Ryder moved the formation of the society, and Captain Gordon seconded the resolution. General Ord moved the next resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. Jos. Ivimey. It is to the substance of the speeches of Captain Gordon, and the Rev. Mr. Ivimey, that I think it my duty to call your attention, premising that not one word of disap-

probation at the assertions made by these persons, or at the sentiments uttered, was expressed by the Chairman, or by any person present ; and we are therefore compelled, with regret, to regard their sentiments as adopted by the meeting.

Captain Gordon, after stating that “ the vast mass of the population of Ireland were in a state of the most grievous moral degradation ; and that crime, rapine, and bloodshed were the effect of this moral degradation,” inquired to what this alleged depravity was owing ; and he replied, that “ he had no hesitation in answering, to the nature and essence of the Roman Catholic religion, and to the total ignorance of the word of God prevailing in that community. Hence the necessity of a standing army of 30,000 men, and an armed police throughout the whole country.” He then proceeded to enumerate the number of criminals tried and condemned at the late assizes at Cork, Limerick, Tipperary, and Westmeath ; and exultingly declared again, that “ all this he attributed to the nature and essence of the Roman Catholic Religion.”—[*hear, hear.*].—The Rev. Mr. Ivimey was not quite so strong in his pretended illustrations of alleged facts ; but in the coarseness of his abuse, the Rev. Gentleman outstripped his competitor. “ He was one of those who would use no measured terms when speaking of Popery : it was the abomination that maketh desolate ; it was a great lie, a long lie, and made up of every species of aggravation. It exposed its wretched followers to every sort of misery here, and eternal perdition hereafter.” The assertion made by these persons is neither more nor less than that the Roman Catholic faith produces the total breach of every moral obligation ; and that the professors of it are the most abandoned and worthless of mankind.

This is the proposition distinctly avowed at a meeting held for the professed object of promoting the religious principles of the Reformation,—my Lord Farnham in the Chair, with names around him of still higher note than his own,—and not one murmur of disapprobation was whispered !—I should be wanting in my duty, did I not bring these facts before you. Are we then, indeed, the outcasts of society which these persons would teach the public that we are ? Does that form of christianity which we profess, really inculcate every breach of morality ? This was the religion of our Alfreds, our Henrys, our Edwards, of our Mores, and our Fishers ; of the most splendid heroes, and exemplary characters that this country has known ; of those who founded our seats of learning, to whom we are indebted for the preservation of science and of letters, and for very numerous editions of the holy writings. Does this religion necessarily cramp the genius, or debase the heart ? God forbid that any form of christianity should teach its votaries to violate the dictates of christian charity, or the laws that are instituted for the well-being of society. The long catalogue of atrocious crime that now stains the moral character of this Protestant country, and which is nowhere exceeded in enormity, is not attributed to the principles of the Protestant faith. These crimes sprang from the disregard of the moral obligations imposed by every form of christian worship ; and if any cause, more than another, tends to loosen the bonds of religious duty, it is the conduct of these professors of one form of faith, who shew so little of the vital spirit of christianity, as to pour out the most rancorous and insulting denunciations on the heads of the professors of another. The vast mass of the people of Ireland, who are declared to be in a state of the most grievous moral de-

gradation, are beyond comparison more moral in their habits than the people of England ; nor is their ignorance so great as that of thousands here who affect a tone of insulting superiority over them. An immense unemployed population, swarms over the land, without any legal claim to relief : and in such a state of society, where the severest pressure of distress weighs upon so many millions, crime must abound : but is it honest to look into their faith for the causes of it ! Is there no source from which her various miseries may be deduced without imputing them to the faith of the people ? Suppose that England, regarding the strength of Ireland as injurious to her interests, had made it the leading feature of her policy to degrade, to weaken, and impoverish her, she might be steeped in misery to the very lips, without owing her misery to her faith. Had England proceeded still further : had she mocked by insult, the misery she had created by violence ; traduced the morals, as well as the religion of the population ; and then, to complete the climax, had she sent forth her modern apostles with the bible in one hand, and the bayonet in the other, to wean the people from their veneration for a priesthood who, in the worst of times, had laboured to allay irritation ; whose influence had always been exercised in the exemplary discharge of their pastoral duties ; who had lived with their flocks, been sharers in their privations, and, in the midst of pestilence, had never shrunk from the bed of contagion ; if England had acted thus, would there have been need to search into the faith of Ireland for the cause of the deplorable position in which she stands ? That position is not, as Captain Gordon states it to be, the work of the Catholic religion : the Roman Catholic religion has taught the miserable victims of English cupidity to submit to in-

justice and oppression, and to seek consolation in the hopes of a better world ; it has been their only solace, and has effected what was beyond the reach of human power,—it has kept them loyal : and let the modern reformist pause before he attempts to rob the poor Irish peasant of these pastors and this religion, lest he remove the only barrier between Ireland and despair.

No calculation of consequences, no estimate of political expediency, no debtor and creditor account of loss or gain, shall prevent me from raising my humble voice to repel such foul slanders on all that men of honour value most. Not that we will be induced by any provocation to retaliate : we know how to respect ourselves ; and neither Captain Gordon, nor Mr. Ivimey, shall be able to reproach Catholics with being goaded by the foulest slanders into retaliation. We will not meet the insults cast on our religion, by imputing atrocities to the religion of others. Instances have frequently occurred of persons of other religious persuasions addressing our meetings, and expressing sentiments of hostility to our tenets ; they have been always attended to, not only with patience, but with marked attention and courtesy. We violate not the decencies of life ; on the contrary, if a person profess his opinions in the singleness of his heart, and from the real conviction of his mind, we can honour his sincerity, though we dissent from his belief. We take every occasion publicly to declare, on the word of men of honour, that we claim equal rights with our fellow-subjects, on the broad principle, that human legislation exceeds its legitimate boundary when it presumes to visit with pains, penalties, or disqualifications, the conscientious followers of any form of christian worship. We appeal from the verdict of violent and enthusiastic men, to a better tribu

nal, to the good sense and honest hearts of our countrymen; we implore them dispassionately to examine our principles and our conduct, and to decide which is the best subject, which best merits the approval of his country, the Catholic who is obedient to the laws, performs with fidelity every relative duty, and disavows on his honour, and his oath, every obnoxious principle or opinion, and sincerely desires to live in harmony with all the world; or the votary of the new reformation, who foment religious acrimony by calumnious imputations, by reviving expiring prejudices, and invoking the continuance of those humiliating laws, that have been too long the bane of Ireland, and the disgrace of England. We court fair and honourable discussion; it is the privilege of Englishmen, and the parent of truth: but we would ask Mr. Ivimey, and Mr. Gordon, and Lord Farnham, whether theirs is this description of discussion, this calm debate, that can alone advance a good cause; whether these scandalous imputations, bearing falsehood on the face of them, are calculated or intended to promote the cause of truth? We would ask whether christian charity is a Reformation virtue? In one word, we would ask the Protestants of England whether they are parties to such accusations as these? If they are, let them no longer lavish abuse on others. The worst spirit of the darkest and most intolerant times cannot, in the estimation of any sober-minded man, be his faith what it may, cannot have exceeded the virulent and anti-christian spirit that appears to have actuated these persons on this occasion, when they were met to promote the principles of the Reformation. If these are not the principles of the followers of the Reformation, and we should blush for our country if we thought they were, then do we implore them candidly to come forward,

and to disavow being parties to such imputations, and by so doing to rescue the principles of the Reformation from foul disgrace. Other meetings of a similar description will perhaps be held; and we do hope that persons who are not Catholics will be found ready to wipe so foul an aspersion from the character of christianity. We ask the public to examine us with candour, to judge us by our conduct, and not to give credence to the accusations of persons who evidently bear towards us the most rancorous hostility. We call on that large portion of our countrymen who certainly have not the leisure, perhaps not the means, to come to a dispassionate conclusion themselves, and who, from the first dawn of reason, have had their minds perverted with prejudices against us; we call on the well-intentioned portion of the community who cannot judge but through the eyes of others, to be cautious to whom they give their confidence. The clergy of the establishment, almost to a man, are against us. It is necessary to state the fact in our own defence; their hopes of advancement in their profession have been made to depend on their hostility to us. It is a fact beyond dispute, that no clergyman of the establishment, had his learning, his virtues, his attainments, been almost super-human, would have had a chance of preferment, if he had dared to advocate our cause: whilst, on the contrary, the bitterest rancour against us was the surest road to preferment. And are these the persons to whom those who seek impartial information on the merits of our question, ought to apply for the knowledge of our real principles? Is there no other quarter where impartiality may be more reasonably expected, where may be found as much information and talent, united with as much general reading, more knowledge of the world and of society, and a more perfect

acquaintance with the practice and spirit of British law, and of the various institutions of this country? I mean the bar of England; that bar, the members of which, without any solicitation from us, have become the spontaneous advocates of our claims. On one of the last days of the session, his Majesty's Attorney-General presented a petition to the House of Commons, signed by 239 Sergeants and Barristers-at-law, in favour of the Catholic claims; comprising in their number a weight of legal talent, greater probably than ever before appeared at the foot of any document of a similar character. Can these distinguished persons be suspected of want of knowledge of the subject which their petition embraces? They must necessarily, from their general communication with the world, and the nature of their reading, be acquainted with it in all its bearings and details. Are they actuated by hostility to the institutions of their country? They are by education, by habit, by birth, the firmest supporters of them. Or do they espouse our cause from interested motives? No possible personal advantage can accrue to them from their advocacy of it. What must have been their motive for this voluntary act? Like honourable men, they scorned to remain parties to a base delusion; they felt that their silent acquiescence in the state of the laws in our regard, stamped a share of the disgrace upon them, and they disdained to wear the imputation any longer. Are these the persons who would consent to lend themselves to the free and unconstrained practice of a religion, "the nature and essence of which is, to plunge the great mass of a people into a state of the most grievous moral degradation," and, by their criminal delinquency, "to render necessary a standing army of 30,000 men, and an armed police throughout the country?" I do not hesitate

to express my full conviction, that if fair opportunities were afforded to the people of this country of judging this question on its merits, without having their prejudices studiously fostered, twelve months would not elapse before they would see their own injustice, and join with the bar of England in petitions to the legislature for the total remission of the laws in force against us. The question is not now *whether* the Catholic Claims shall be granted, but *when* they shall be granted? Whether it is better to prolong a system of irritation and insult, producing exasperation and violence; or whether it be not more wise, and more just, to allay the discontent without loss of time? Were the law in Ireland accessible to all, equal to all, and mildly administered, the people would soon learn to regard it as a protection, and not as a scourge. Their acquired propensity to violence would soften into habits of patient industry; and that overgrown army, which helps to impoverish England, and to prolong the discontent of Ireland, would convert their swords into plough-shares, and join in promoting the common prosperity.

APPENDIX.

No. II.

DR. POYNTER'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY.

The following observations on that declaration in the oath of supremacy, which says that “ *No foreign Prelate ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, ECCLESIASTICAL or SPIRITUAL, within these Realms,*” were made by the late Dr. Poynter in March, 1821, and transmitted by him to the Managers of Mr. Plunkett’s late Catholic Relief Bill. He has herein placed the distinction between *spiritual* and *temporal*, *ecclesiastical* and *civil*, power and jurisdiction, in so clear a point of view; and has so happily illustrated his positions by one or two cases, in which the two powers would seem to conflict, that our most strenuous adversaries may rectify their confused or erroneous notions on this subject, and thus be induced generously to cease from alarming the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the bigotted part of the community, by the unfounded versions they are continually promulgating of this article of our doctrine.

“ If the pope *ought not* to have any ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction, &c. within these realms, he ought to have none at all; for he has no civil jurisdiction here. The above clause denies the divine right of the pope, as head of the church of Christ, to govern the universal church.

“ What is the proper and obvious meaning of the terms *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual*?

“ The term *spiritual* does not here mean the same as incorporeal or internal: but it means that which in its nature directly tends to a supernatural end, or is ordained to produce a supernatural effect. Thus, sacrifice, which is an external oblation of a sensible victim to God; and the sacraments, which are visible rites, are *spiritual* things, because they tend to the worship of God and to the sanctification of souls. That is called temporal, which in its nature and institution tends directly to the good order of civil society.

“ The power of the church is *spiritual*; and the power of the state is *temporal*.

“ By the term *ecclesiastical* is properly meant whatever in its own nature belongs to the spiritual power and government of the church—as by the term *civil* is meant whatever in its own nature belongs to the temporal power and government of the state.

“ This is the proper and limited meaning of the terms *ecclesiastical* and *civil*, when the two powers are in a state of separation from each other, and act without any mutual co-operation. Such was the *ecclesiastical* power of the church under the heathen emperors; such was the *civil* power of the Roman state during the same period.

“ When the two powers are associated together by a friendly concordate, the *ecclesiastical* power has sometimes exercised acts of a *civil* nature, by the *concession* of the

state; and the *civil* power has sometimes exercised acts of an *ecclesiastical* nature, by the *concession* of the church. In these cases, the term *ecclesiastical*, when applied to courts and causes of a mixed nature, under the jurisdiction of an ecclesiastical person as judge, is to be understood in a less strict and less proper sense. In this sense some of our courts in England retain the name of *ecclesiastical*. It is not in this mixed sense, that the spiritual power of the pope, and of Catholic bishops in England, is now called *ecclesiastical*.

“ At the change of religion in England, the state totally divorced and separated itself from the Catholic church, and withdrew every portion of *civil* power from the pope and Catholic clergy, which they had ever exercised in England by the *concession* of the state. Consequently, the spiritual powers which the pope and Catholic clergy now hold and exercise over the Catholics in England, are **PURELY** *ecclesiastical* without the least mixture of any civil or temporal power whatever.

“ This power and authority, *purely ecclesiastical*, is that which Christ gave originally to his apostles; and which was, by his ordinance, to be transmitted from them to their legitimate successors, to the end of time, for the purpose of enabling them to preach his faith, to promulgate his new law, to administer his sacraments, to govern his church, and to enforce the observance of his general commands by particular and efficacious regulations. By the exercise of this *ecclesiastical* power, the church, from the earliest ages, without the co-operation of the civil power, has issued many laws and ordinances relating to the form of divine worship, to the manner and circumstances of administering or of receiving the sacraments, to the observance of the great Christian festivals, to the rules of abstinence and to the fast of Lent, to the impedi-

ments and celebration of matrimony, to the conduct of the clergy, to the qualifications requisite for holy orders, to the limits of the jurisdiction of the different orders of the hierarchy, &c. Many such external and purely ecclesiastical regulations, were made by the church, and enforced among the faithful in different parts of the world, before the church had any where any connection with the state. The object of the church in making them was, to enforce the observance of the commands and institutions of Christ; which are not of a temporal nature, but which tend directly to the worship of God and to the sanctification of the souls of men. The means by which the church enforced the observance of them, were not of a *civil* nature, but were *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual*; viz. the influence of her authority, and the privation of the benefits of her communion. ‘*The weapons of our warfare are not carnal.*’ 2 Cor. x. 4.

“In establishing and enforcing these ecclesiastical laws and regulations, the pope has from the earliest ages borne a principal part. Every Catholic must acknowledge that the pope, as head of the church, has ecclesiastical and spiritual authority over all the members of the Catholic church. This authority, which he now exercises over the Catholics in England, is *purely ecclesiastical* and spiritual; it has not the least mixture of any portion of civil or temporal authority annexed to it. It is chiefly exercised here in appointing bishops, and in giving them powers for the spiritual government of the Catholics in their respective dioceses or districts; in superintending the religious conduct of the Catholics; and in granting dispensations from the ecclesiastical impediments of matrimony, when necessity requires. But this ecclesiastical and spiritual authority of the pope in England, as well as that of the Catholic bishops here, is not invested with any civil formality, nor

has it any civil effect. In its object and in its means, it stands in a very *distinct* order from the civil power of the state. This may be illustrated by one or two cases.

“A Catholic confesses to a priest that he has injured his neighbour in his property or good name. The priest admonishes him of the obligation of making restitution as far as he is able, to the extent of the injury done, if he wishes to be reconciled to God, and to be admitted to the sacraments. The man refuses to make restitution. In this case the priest can only urge him by advice and by command, to comply with this moral obligation; and if he persists in his refusal to do his duty, by refusing to admit him to the participation of the spiritual benefit of the sacraments. But the priest cannot employ any *civil* means, such as imprisonment, fine, &c. to compel him to make restitution to which he is bound by the law of nature, and by the positive law of God.

“In the same manner, the pope cannot enforce in England the observance of a divine or ecclesiastical precept by any civil or temporal punishment, but only by ecclesiastical or spiritual means; such as depriving a Catholic clergyman of his spiritual powers, or others of the participation of the sacraments and of the communion of the church.

“In cases of impediments of matrimony, on which the laws of England are different from the laws of the Catholic church, the laws of the church have their proper and distinct effect, and are not enforced by any civil means. Suppose then that two Catholics, first cousins, marry according to the forms of the law of England, their marriage is valid and good according to law, as the degree of first cousins is not a legal impediment; but their marriage is considered by the Catholic church as invalid and null, *ab initio*, in conscience and in the sight of God; because

the degree of first cousins is an *impedimentum dirimens*, totally annulling the matrimonial contract in the sight of God. In this case, the Catholic bishop or priest would inform the parties of the invalidity of their marriage, and of the conscientious obligation of their separating. If they refuse to separate, he cannot compel them by any civil means; if they have children, he cannot declare them illegitimate, so as to make them incapable of succeeding to the titles and estates of the father, or of enjoying the temporal benefits of legitimate children. But if they refuse to separate, the priest can refuse to admit them to the sacraments of the Catholic church; and if they have children, these children will be ecclesiastically illegitimate, so as to be incapable of being admitted to holy orders. Hence it appears evidently, that the ecclesiastical and the civil powers are clearly distinct from each other in their means and effects. Whilst the Catholic is bound by the law of God to acknowledge that the king has temporal authority for the government of the state, he is equally bound by the law of Christ to acknowledge that the pope has ecclesiastical and spiritual authority for the government of the Catholic church, and of all the members of the Catholic church wherever they are. If any Catholic were to swear that the pope ought not to have any ecclesiastical authority in England, he would abjure the divine right of the pope to govern the members of the Catholic church; he would abjure the principle of the supremacy of the pope; he would separate himself from the centre of Catholic unity and communion; he would, *ipso facto*, cease to be a Catholic.

(Signed) WILLIAM POYNTER, V. A.

4, Castle Street, Holborn, March 5th, 1821.

APPENDIX.

No. III.

TESTIMONIES IN FAVOUR OF THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION, AND OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

THE EUCHARIST.

It is an article of Catholic belief, that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly and really contained the Body of Christ, which was delivered for us, and his blood, which was shed for the remission of sins; the substance of the bread and wine being, by the power of God, changed into the substance of his blessed body and blood, the species or appearances of bread and wine, by the will of the same God, remaining as they were. This change has been properly called Transubstantiation.

SCRIPTURE.

John vi. 51, 52. *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread, that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world.*—54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59. *Except you*

eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.—He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day.—For my flesh is meat indeed; and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him. As the living father hath sent me, and I live by the father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28.—And while they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave it to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat: This is my body. And taking the chalice, he gave thanks: and gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this.—For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins.—Mark xiv. 22, 23, 24. And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave it to them, and said: Take ye, This is my body. And having taken the chalice; giving thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it.—And he said to them: This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many.—Luke xxii. 19, 20. And taking bread, he gave thanks, and broke, and gave it to them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you: Do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner, the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.—1 Cor. x. 16. The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?—Ibid. xi. 23, 24, 25, 26. For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered to you; That the Lord Jesus, the same night in

which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke it, and said: Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which shall be delivered for you: this do for a commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink of it, for the commemoration of me.—For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come.

FATHERS.^(a)

CENT. I.

S. IGNATIUS,^(b) G. C.

These Gnostic heretics “abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ,^(c)”

(a) The capital letters L. C. are used to designate the Fathers of the Latin Church, and G. C. those of the Greek Church.

(b) St. Ignatius was bishop of Antioch, the second from St. Peter; and having governed that church about 40 years, suffered martyrdom at Rome, by the command of the emperor Trajan, in the beginning of the second century, leaving behind him seven epistles, addressed to different churches, and acknowledged to be genuine. He had been the disciple of St. John, and his letters breathe the whole spirit of that apostle.

(c) δια το μη ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σαρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτηρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

which suffered for our sins, and which the father by his goodness resuscitated. Rejecting, therefore, this gift of God, they die in their disputes." *Ep. ad. Smyrn. p. 36. T. ii. PP. Apost. Amstelædami, 1724.*—"I take no delight in food that perishes, nor in the pleasures of this life. What I desire is the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the son of God,^(d) who was born of the seed of David; and I desire the drink of God, his blood, which is charity incorruptible, and eternal life." *Ep. ad. Rom. p. 29.*

CENT. II.

S. JUSTIN,^(e) L. C.

"OUR prayers being finished, we embrace one another with the kiss of peace. Then to him who presides over the brethren, is presented bread, and wine tempered with water; having received which, he gives glory to the father of all things, in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and returns thanks, in many prayers, that he has

^(d) ὃς ἐστὶ σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

^(e) A Christian philosopher, by birth a Greek, who suffered martyrdom at Rome, about the year 166, having, a few years before, addressed two apologies, in favour of the Christians, to the emperor Antoninus Pius and to the Roman senate. In these is contained much curious matter on the doctrine, the manners, and the religious ceremonies of the early Christians. Justin is also author of other works, particularly of a *Dialogue with the Jew*, named *Tryphon*.

been deemed worthy of these gifts. These offices being duly performed, the whole assembly, in acclamation, answers, *Amen*; when the ministers, whom we call deacons, distribute to each one present a portion of the blessed bread, and the wine and water. Some is also taken to the absent. This food we call the Eucharist, of which they alone are allowed to partake, who believe the doctrines taught by us, and have been regenerated by water for the remission of sin, and who live as Christ ordained. Nor do we take these gifts, as common bread and common drink;^(f) but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation; in the same manner, we have been taught, that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words which he spoke. and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate.^(g) The apostles, in the commentaries written by them, which are called Gospels, have delivered, that Jesus so commanded, when taking bread, having given thanks, he said: *Do this in remembrance of me: This is my body.* In like manner, taking the cup, and giving thanks, he said: *This is my blood:* and that he distributed both to them only.” *Apol. I. p. 95, 96, 97. Edit. Londini, an. 1722.*

S. IRENÆUS,^(h) L. C.

“ It is our duty to make an offering to God, and with a

(f) οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινον ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινον πομα.

(g) ἐκεῖν τὸ σαρκοποιηθέντος, Ἰησοῦ καὶ σαρκὰ καὶ αἷμα ἐδίδαχθημεν εἶναι.

(h) *St. Irenæus*, though by birth a Greek, was bishop of Lyons in the second century; and in his youth had lived with St. Poly-

pure heart, a sincere faith, a firm hope, and a fervent charity, to present to the maker of all things the first fruits of his creatures. But this pure oblation the church alone makes. The Jews make it not, for their hands are stained with blood; and they received not the word that is offered to God. Nor do the assemblies of heretics make it: for how can these prove that the bread over which the words of thanksgiving have been pronounced, is the body of their Lord, and the cup his blood,⁽ⁱ⁾ while they do not admit that he is the Son, that is, the Word of the Creator of the world? Or how, again, do they maintain that the flesh turns to corruption and partakes not of life, which is nourished with the body and blood of the Lord? Wherefore let them either give up their opinion, or cease from making that offering. But our sentiment accords with the nature of the eucharist, and the eucharist again confirms our sentiment. The bread that we receive is no longer common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, terrestrial and celestial."^(k) *Adv. Hær. Lib. iv. c. xxxiv. p. 326,*

carp, bishop of Smyrna, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist: this brings him near to the apostolic times. In what year he died is not ascertained; probably about the close of the century. He left behind him a *Treatise against the Heresies of the Age*, in five books. Of this work, which contains much that is highly valuable, and which was written in Greek, a Latin version of great antiquity, but harsh and often obscure, alone remains, some passages excepted, which have been preserved in their original language. Some fragments also are extant.

(i) Corpus esse Domini sui, et calicem sanguinis sui.

(k) οὐκετι κοινος ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐνχαριστια, ἐκ δυο πραγμάτων συνεσθηκνία, ἐπιγειον τε καὶ οὐρανιον. The heretics against whom he writes, maintaining that Christ was not the word in the lan-

327.—“ They are truly vain (these heretics) who contemn the whole divine system, and denying the salvation and regeneration of the flesh, maintain that it is not susceptible of incorruption. According to this, then, the Lord did not redeem us by his blood; nor is the cup of the eucharist the participation of his blood; nor the bread which we break, the participation of his body. When, therefore, the mingled chalice and the broken bread receive the word of God, they become the eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, by which the substance of our flesh is increased and strengthened: how then can they pretend that this flesh is not susceptible of eternal life? And as a section of the vine laid in the earth produces fruit in due season, and as, in like manner, the grain of corn is multiplied by the blessing of God, which afterwards are used for the benefit of man, and receiving on them the word of God, become the eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ;⁽¹⁾ so our bodies nourished by that eucharist, and then laid in the earth and dissolved in it, shall in due time rise again.” *Ibid. L. v. c. 11. p. 395, 397, 399.*

guage of St. John, by whom the world was made, and that the material things of the world were adverse to Christ—was it consistent in them, he says, to say that Christ by his ordinance, changed the bread and wine into his body and blood, hostile as they were to his nature—which, however, they professed to believe—and that the eucharist thus formed was the offering most acceptable to God?

(1) ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

TERTULLIAN,^(m) L. C.

Having shewn, in many instances, how anxious our Saviour was to accomplish all that the prophets had foretold concerning him, he adds:—"Professing his ardent desire to eat the pasch as his own, he took the bread, and distributing it to his disciples, he made it his body, saying: *This is my body*, that is, the figure of my body.⁽ⁿ⁾ But it would not have been this figure, had not his body been real; for a thing void of reality, as is a phantom, cannot be represented by a figure: and if they say that Christ formed to himself a body of the bread, not having a real body, it was then this bread he was going to sacrifice for us. How stupid is Marcion not to understand that bread was the ancient figure of the body of Jesus Christ, spoken by Jeremiah: *They have devised devices against me, saying; Come, let us put wood into his bread,*^(o) that is, the cross upon his body. Thus Christ, illustrating the ancient figures, sufficiently declared by calling

^(m) *Tertullian* was a native and citizen of Carthage, contemporary with St. Irenæus, whom he survived. The zeal and talents with which he defended the Christian cause, and vindicated its faith and discipline, have immortalized his name, which, however, suffered by his defection to the errors of the Montanists. His genuine works are not few, written with great erudition; but of which the style, resembling the asperity of his mind, is inelegant, rude, and often intricate, though always nervous and impressive.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *Corpus suum illum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum* dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei.

^(o) The reading of the Latin vulgate—*Mittamus lignum in panem ejus*.

the bread his body, what was at that time (the time of Jeremiah) his intention that the bread should signify.”^(p) *Adversus Marcion*, L. iv. c. xl. p. 733.—He had before advanced the same sentiment; L. iii. p. 677.—And again: “He rejected not the bread by which he represents his own body.”^(q) *Ib.* L. i. p. 624.—In other passages, following his contemporaries, Tertullian is less ambiguous: “Our flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ,^(r) that the soul may be nourished with God.” *De Resurrect. carnis*, c. viii. p. 569.—There are Christians worse than Jews; “for these laid violent hands on Jesus but once, but they daily insult his body.”^(s) *De Idol.* c. vii. p. 240.—“Christ is our bread, because Christ is life, and bread is life. *I* (he says, John vi) *am the bread of life*. And again:

(p) The opinion of the Marcionite heretics whom he combats, was, that the two covenants were opposed to each other. This he refutes by shewing that Christ was anxious to apply to himself the prophecies of the old covenant, and to fulfil them. Thus Jeremiah having used the word *bread* to prefigure the body of Christ, Tertullian remarks that when Christ said of the bread, *This is my body*, he plainly signified that the prophecy was fulfilled, the bread being the ancient *figure* used to denote his body. *This is my body*, that is, the figure of my body, agreeably to the expression of the prophet Jeremiah.—The same heretics also pretended that Christ, having no real body, adopted the bread for his body; so that according to them, in the eucharist was a real body, that is, the bread but no sacrament; no sign or figure of the real body of Christ.—Endless have been the contests on the meaning of the above passage. See *Perpétuité de la Foi*, vol. iii. lib. 11.

(q) *Corpus suum repræsentat*. The latter word is often used by him and others, for—*præsentem facere*, to render present.

(r) *Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur*.

(s) *Quotidie corpus ejus lacesunt*.

The bread is the word of God, that came down from heaven. As also because his body is acknowledged to be in the bread.^(t)—*This is my body*: wherefore, when we pray for our daily bread, we beg for a perpetuity in Christ, and individuity from his body.” *De Orat. c. vi. p. 181.*

CENT. III.

ORIGEN,^(u) G. C.

THOUGH this great man was very fond of allegorising, that is, of not confining himself to the literal meaning of the scriptures; yet, on the subject of the eucharist, he seems sometimes to speak sufficiently plain: thus in his great work against Celsus, he says: “We who study to please the Creator of all things with prayers and giving of thanks for benefits received, eat of the breads that are offered, which by prayer are made a holy body.^(x) By this, they who partake of it with a pure spirit, are rendered more holy.” *Lib. viii. T. 1. p. 766.*—Again: “You that have been accustomed to be present at the

^(t) *Corpus ejus in pane censetur.*

^(u) *Origen* was contemporary with *St. Clement of Alexandria*, and succeeded him as catechist or teacher, in the celebrated school of that city. Few men, from a variety of causes, have left behind them a greater name, applauded and opposed, admired and persecuted. His works, as we have them, are imperfect; as written, they were almost innumerable. He died about the year 252.

^(x) *προσαγομενους ἄρτους ἐσθιομεν, σωμα γενομενους δια την ἐνχην ἁγιον τι.*

divine mysteries, know when you receive the body of the Lord,^(y) with what care and veneration you preserve it, lest any particle of it fall to the ground, or be lost; and you think yourselves guilty, and with reason, if it should so happen through your negligence." *Hom. xiii. in Exod. T. ii. p. 176.*—"In former times, baptism was obscurely represented in the cloud and in the sea: but now regeneration is in kind, in water, and in the Holy Ghost. Then, obscurely, manna was the food; but now in kind the flesh of the word of God is the true food;^(z) even as he said: *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*" *Hom.^(a) vii. in Num. T. ii. p. 290.*

S. HIPPOLYTUS,^(b) G. C.

Commenting on the words of Proverbs ix.; *Wisdom hath built herself a house*, he says: "He (Christ) *prepared his table*, that is, the promised knowledge of the Holy Trinity; and moreover, his venerable and sacred body and

(y) Cum suscipitis corpus Domini.

(z) Tunc in ænigmate erat manna cibus, nunc autem in specie caro verbi Dei est verus cibus.

(a) These homilies, which are not extant in Greek, are thought to have been rather loosely translated by Rufinus of Aquileja; but as Rufinus lived in the fifth century, the contemporary and antagonist of St. Jerome, his testimony alone serves to prove the faith of the age.

(b) St. Hippolytus flourished in the beginning of the third century, but of what see he was bishop is uncertain. Of the many works he wrote, only fragments remain, which were published by Fabricius, in 1716. He suffered martyrdom about the year 230.

blood, which are every day offered up^(c) in remembrance of that divine and mysterious supper.—*Come, eat my bread and drink the wine which I have mingled for you,* that is, his divine body and his venerable blood, which he gave us to eat and drink^(d) for the remission of sins.” *In Prov. c. ix. T. 1. p. 282. Edit. Hamburg, 1716.*

S. CYPRIAN,^(e) L. C.

Speaking of those, who in time of persecution had through weakness denied their faith, he relates instances of signal judgments that had fallen on many, who after that, dared to profane the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. The facts may, perhaps, by some be disputed; but the belief of the narrator on the point of the real presence in the elements, cannot be questioned. A woman having brought home with her—which then was usual—part of the consecrated bread, when she attempted to open the box which contained *the Holy Thing of the Lord*,^(f) was alarmed by a rising flame. And a man in similar circumstances, opening his hand, discovered nothing but ashes.”

(c) το τιμιον και ακραντον αυτου σωμα και αιμα, α καθ' εκαστην επιτελονται θυομενα.

(d) την θειαν αυτου σαρκα και το τιμιον αυτου σωμα.

(e) *St. Cyprian* was bishop of Carthage, and died a martyr in the year 258. Actively concerned in the affairs of his own and of other churches; he corresponded widely, and has left us eighty-one Epistles on various ecclesiastical subjects, and several Tracts; among which is one on the *Unity of the Church*, written against the Novatian schismatics, who disturbed the peace of the church.

(f) In qua Domini Sanctum fuit.

De Lapsis, p. 132, 133.—Of the same weak Christians he had before said: “Returning from the altar of the devil, they approach, with filthy and sordid hands, to the holy of the Lord. In this state of contamination they invade his body.^(g) Regardless of the menaces of God, they dare to offer violence to the body and blood of the Lord;^(h) thus sinning more against him than when they denied him.” *Ibid.* p. 128.—“Christ is the bread of life, and this is not the bread of all, but it is ours: and as we say *Our Father*, because he is the father of the intelligent and the believing; so we say our bread, because Christ whose body we touch,⁽ⁱ⁾ is our bread. This bread we daily pray for, lest, belonging to Christ, and receiving the eucharist daily for the food of salvation, we be withheld by some grievous crime from that heavenly bread, and be separated from the body of Christ. He has said: *I am the bread of life who came down from heaven. If any one eat of my bread, he shall live for ever. But the bread which I shall give, is my flesh for the life of the world.* Hence it is manifest, that they have this life who approach his body^(k) and receive the eucharist.” *De Orat. Dom.* p. 146, 147.

He elsewhere laments, that some ministers of the altar dared, before the forms of repentance and confession were fulfilled, to distribute the Eucharist, and “thus profane the holy body of the Lord.”^(l) *Ep.* xv. p. 34.—“At this time, peace is necessary not to the weak, but to the strong; that while we excite and exhort them to battle, we leave

(g) Domini corpus invadunt.

(h) Vis infertur corpori ejus et sanguini.

(i) Qui corpus ejus contingimus. (k) Qui corpus ejus attingunt.

(l) Sanctum Domini corpus profanare audeant.

them not naked and unarmed, but fortified by the body and blood of Christ.^(m)—For how can we urge them to shed their own blood, if we refuse them the blood of Christ? Or how do we fit them for the cup of martyrdom, unless we first admit them in the church to partake of the chalice of the Lord?" *Ep. lvii. p. 117.*—"When the Lord called the bread his body, which bread is formed of many grains, he indicated the union of his people; and calling the wine his blood, which is pressed from many grapes, he signified the conjunction of his flock." *Ep. lxix. p. 182.*

CENT. IV.

COUNCIL OF NICE, G. C.

Condemning an abuse, which had crept in, that deacons in some places, administered the Eucharist to priests, the council says, "that neither canon, nor custom, has taught, that they (deacons), who have themselves no power to offer, should give the body of Christ to them that possess that power."⁽ⁿ⁾ *Can. xviii. Conc. Gen. T. ii. p. 38.*

JUVENCUS,^(o) L. C.

Speaking of the institution of the Eucharist, he says

^(m) *Protectione sanguinis et corporis Christi muniamus.*

⁽ⁿ⁾ *το σωμα του Χριστου.*

^(o) He was a native of Spain and a priest, and has left us the Life of Christ in hexameter verse. He flourished about the year 329, under Constantine the Great.

“ Christ taught his disciples, that he delivered to them his own body ;” and when he gave them the chalice, “ he taught them, that he had distributed to them his blood : and said ; This blood remits the sins of the people : drink this, it is mine.”^(p) *Bibl. Max. PP. T. iv. p. 74.*

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA,^(q) G. C.

“ Since then, as the New Testament establishes, we have been instructed to celebrate the memory of this sacrifice of his body and of his saving blood,^(r) again we are taught by the prophet David to say : *Thou hast prepared a table before me.* (Ps. 22.) In these things he openly signifies a mystical unction, and the august offerings of the table of Christ, by which we have learnt to offer to our supreme Lord, through the hand of this great high-priest, unbloody, rational, and benignant sacrifices.”^(s) *Dem. Evang. L. 1. c. x. p. 39.*—“ He shall have delight in the Lord, whose mind being purged from all defilement, shall eat the living bread, the life-giving flesh of the Lord, and drink his saving blood.”^(t) *Com. in Psal. xxx. v. 1.*

^(p) Discipulos docuit proprium se tradere corpus ;

Edocuitque suum se divisisse cruorem.

Atque ait : Hic sanguis populi delicta remittit :

Hunc potate meum.—

^(q) Eusebius was bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, and the confidential friend of Constantine the Great. Besides an *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books, he is the author of other valuable works, some of which are extant. He died in the year 338.

^(r) τουτε σωματος αυτου και του σωτηριου ιματος.

^(s) τας αναιμους και λογικας, αυτω τε προσηγεις θυσιας.

^(t) εσθειν τον ψωντα αρτον και τας ζωοποιους αυτου σαρκας, πινειν τε το σωτηριον αυτου αιμα.

T. ii. pa. 149. *Collect. Nova Montfaucon. Paris. 1706.*—

“ We, who by faith are called to sanctification, possess the bread from heaven; that is, Christ, or his body. ^(u) Should it be asked, what the power of that body is? we answer: It is vivifying, because it gives life to the world.”
Com. in c. iii. Isa. p. 368. Ibid.

ST. ATHANASIUS,^(x) G. C.

“ Our Sanctuaries are now pure, as they always were; having been rendered venerable by the blood alone of Christ,^(y) and embellished by his worship.” *Apol. adv. Arian. T. 1. p. 127.* “ Take care then, O Deacon, not to give to the unworthy the blood of the immaculate body, ^(z) lest you incur the guilt of giving holy things to dogs.”
Serm. de Incontam. Myst. T. ii. p. 35. Collect. Nova. Montfaucon.—Parisus, 1706.

S. HILARY,^(a) L. C.

“ If the word, truly, *was made flesh*, and we, truly, re-

^(u) τουτεστι Χριστον, ἡτοι το σωμα αὐτου.

^(x) *St. Athanasius* succeeded *St. Alexander* in the patriarchal chair of Alexandria, in 326, and inherited all his zeal against the Arians. He was one of the most eloquent fathers of the church, and the most strenuous supporter of her faith during a period of forty-seven years. He died about the year 373, leaving us many monuments of his erudition, piety, and zeal.

^(y) μονη σεμννομενα τη αιματι του Χριστου.

^(z) την πορφυραν του αναμαρτητου σωματος.

^(a) *St. Hilary* was bishop of Poitiers, in France, and the great champion of the orthodox faith in the western church, against the

ceive this word for our food :^(b) how can he be thought not to dwell naturally in us, who assumed the nature of our flesh inseparably united to him, and communicates, in the sacrament, that nature to us? For thus, we are all one : because the Father is in Christ, and Christ in us.— We are not to speak of heavenly things as we do of human.^(c) Of the natural verity of Christ in us, whatever we speak, we speak foolishly and wickedly, unless we learn of him ; for it is he that said : *my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* (John. vi. 56.) There is no place left to doubt of the truth of Christ's flesh and blood :^(d) for now, by the profession of the Lord himself, and according to our belief, it is truly flesh, and truly blood. But he himself attests how we are in him by the sacramental communication of his body and blood : *And the world, says he, sees me not, but you see me, because I live and you shall live ; for I am in my father, and you are in me, and I am in you.* (John xiv. 19, 20.) If he wished the unity of will alone to be understood, why would he establish a certain order and progression in the formation of it ; but that he should be in the father, by the nature of the divinity ; we in him, by his corporal birth ; and he in us by the sacramental mystery." *De Trin. L. viii. p. 954, 955, 956.*

Arian heretics. He wrote a work, in twelve books, *On the Trinity ; a Treatise on Synods or Councils ;* and three *Discourses against the Arians*, addressed to the emperor Constantine. St. Hilary died in the year 367.

(b) Verbum carnem cibo dominico sumimus.

(c) Non est humano aut sæculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum.

(d) De veritate carnis et sanguinis non relictus est ambigendi locus.

ST. JAMES OF NISIBIS,^(e) G. C.

In his fourth discourse, *On Prayer*, he says: "None will be cleansed unless they have been washed in the laver of baptism, and have received the body and blood of Christ; for the blood is expiated by this blood, and the body cleansed by this body.—Be assiduous in holy prayer, and in the beginning of all prayer place that which the Lord hath taught us. When you pray, always remember your friends, and me a sinner," &c.

^(e) *St. James* was bishop of Nisibis in Mesopotamia, and was held in much estimation by his contemporaries. He was present at the council of Nice in 325, and died about the year 350. His works, mentioned by Gennadius in the fifth century, were published at Rome in Armenian and Latin, by Antonelli, in 1756. It is to be lamented, that in the course of collating with the original works, the different passages extracted from the various fathers, the editors were unable, at that time, notwithstanding a most diligent search, to find a single copy of this father's writings in England; and have, therefore, been obliged (in this single instance) to depend on the authority of a most learned and laborious author, (noted, however, for his scrupulous accuracy), for the extract they have given; viz. the Rev. Alban Butler, who in his life of this saint, July 11th, quotes it at length from Antonelli's edition.

N.B. I have just learned that a copy of this work has lately found its way into this country, and is now in the *Collegiate Library* at Manchester.

ST. EPHREM OF EDESSA,^(g) G. C.

“ His body, by a new method, is mixed with our bodies; and his most pure blood is transfused into our veins. He is wholly incorporated with us.^(h) And because he loved his church, he was made the bread of life that he might give himself to be eaten.” *Hymn. xxxvii. de Virginitate, Bibl. Orient. Assemani, T. 1. p. 97.*—“ Consider, my beloved, with what fear those stand before the throne, who wait on a mortal king. How much more does it behove us to appear before the heavenly king with fear and trembling, with gravity and awe! Hence it becomes us not to look boldly on the mysteries that lie before us, of the body and blood of our Lord.”⁽ⁱ⁾ *Paræn. xx. T. ii.*

(g) St. Ephrem was a disciple of the above mentioned father, and a deacon of Edessa in Syria. He wrote many works in the language of his country, which were translated into Greek during his life; and were held in such estimation, that in many churches, as St. Jerome testifies in his Catalogue, they were publicly read after the canonical books of scripture. They were published in Latin by Gerârd Vossius, at Rome; and in Greek by Twaites, at Oxford. In 1732 and seqq., Cardinal Quirini, with the aid of J. S. Assemani, gave a new and splendid edition of his works, in six volumes, folio. The three first contain the works which had before been published in Greek and Latin; the three latter, those which he found in the Vatican Library, which are in Syriac, with a Latin translation. St. Ephrem died about the year 379.

(h) *Corpus ejus nova ratione nostris corporibus immistum est; ipsius quoque sanguis purissimus in venas nostras diffusus, totus ipse nos totos pervasit.*

(i) *Proposita mysteria corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri.*

p. 126. *Edit Vossii*.—"Sedulously consider all these things, and believe that they are true as they are related; for if you view them not with the eyes of faith, you cannot rise from earth to heaven, nor in spirit behold what Christ suffered. When the eye of faith is clearly open, it contemplates in a pure light the Lamb of God who was immolated for us, and who gave us his body for our food, to the remission of our sins. This same eye of faith manifestly beholds the Lord, when eating his body and drinking his blood, and indulges no curious enquiry.^(k)—You believe that Christ, the son of God, for you was born in the flesh. Then why do you search into what is inscrutable? Doing this, you prove your curiosity, not your faith. Believe then, and with a firm faith receive the body and blood of our Lord.^(l)—Abraham placed earthly food before celestial spirits, (Gen. xviii.) of which they ate. This was wonderful; but what Christ has done for us greatly exceeds this, and transcends all speech and all conception. To us that are in the flesh, he has given to eat his body and blood. Incapable as I am of comprehending the mysteries of God, I dare not proceed; and should I attempt it, I should shew only my own rashness." *De Nat. Dei. T. iii.*
p. 182. *Ibid.*

(k) Corpus manducat ac sanguinem bibit; haudquaquam curiosè divinam sanctam fidem perscrutans.

(l) Si ista curiosè rimaris, non jam fidelis nuncupaberis, sed curiosus. Esto itaque fidelis. Participa immaculatum corpus et sanguinem Domini tui fide plenissimâ.

ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM,^(m) G. C.

In his instructions, addressed to those who had been newly baptised, he says: "The bread and wine, which before the invocation of the adorable Trinity were nothing but bread and wine, become after this invocation, the body and blood of Christ."⁽ⁿ⁾ *Catag. Mystag.* 1. n. 4. p. 281.—"The eucharistic bread, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ."^(o) *Ibid. Catech.* iii. n. 3. p. 289.—"The doctrine of the blessed Paul alone is sufficient to give certain proofs of the truth of the divine mysteries; and you being deemed worthy of them, are become one body and one blood with Christ. For this great apostle says: *That our Lord in the same night wherein he was delivered, having taken bread and giving thanks, broke it and gave it to his disciples, saying to them; Take and eat, this is my body.* Afterwards he took the cup, and said: *Take and drink, this is my blood.* As then Christ, speaking of the bread, declared and said: This is my body; who shall dare to doubt it? And as speaking of the wine, he positively assured us, and said: This is my blood; who shall doubt

^(m) *St Cyril* was patriarch of Jerusalem, and died about the year 355. The works which he has left, in twenty-three *Catechetical Discourses*, form a full and very accurate abridgement of Christian Doctrine.

⁽ⁿ⁾ ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

^(o) ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ἐνχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπικλήσιν τῆς ἁγίας πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔστι ἄρτος λιτοῦ, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

it, and say that it is not his blood?"^(p) *Catech.* iv. n. 1. p. 292.

"Jesus Christ, in Cana of Galilee, once changed water into wine, by his will alone; and shall we think it less worthy of credit, that he changed wine into his blood? Invited to an earthly marriage, he wrought this miracle; and shall we hesitate to confess that he has given to his children his body to eat, and his blood to drink?"^(r) Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ. For in the type or figure of bread, his body is given to thee; and in the type or figure of wine, his blood is given;^(s) that so being made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with him; thus, the body and blood of Christ being distributed in our members, we become *Christofori*,^(t) that is, we carry Christ with us; and thus, as St. Peter says, "we are made partakers of the divine nature." *Ibid.*—At another time, speaking to the Jews, Jesus Christ says: *Unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye shall have no life in you.* (John vi.) But they not understanding the words spiritually, were offended with them and withdrew from him, because they fancied that he would make them eat human flesh.^(u) In the old dispensation there were loaves

(p) αὐτου οὖν ἀποφηνάμενον, καὶ εἰπόντος περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου, τοῦτο μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, τὶς τολμήσει ἀμφιβαλλεῖν λοιπὸν; καὶ αὐτου βεβαιωσάμενον καὶ ἐφηκοτος, τοῦτο μὲν ἔστι τὸ αἷμα, τὶς ἐνδοιασεῖ ποτε, λεγὼν μὴ εἶναι αὐτου τὸ αἷμα;

(q) καὶ οὐκ ἀξιοπιστος ἐστὶν οἶνον μεταβαλὼν εἰς αἷμα;—

(r) τὴν ἀπολαυσιν τοῦ σώματος αὐτου καὶ τοῦ αἵματος.

(s) ἐν τυπῷ ἄρτου, δίδεται σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τυπῷ οἶνου, δίδεται σοι τὸ αἷμα.

(t) χριστοφοροί.

(u) σαρκοφαγίαν.

of bread which were offered before God, and because they pertained to that old dispensation, they have ceased with it: but now in the new dispensation, there is bread from heaven, and a cup of salvation, which sanctify soul and body. For as the bread is the nourishment which is proper to the body, so the word is the nourishment which is proper to the soul. Wherefore I conjure you, my brethren, not to consider them any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ according to his words; and although your sense might suggest that to you, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honoured with the body and blood of Christ; this knowing, and of this being assured, that what appears to you bread is not bread, but the body of Christ, although the taste judges it to be bread; and that the wine which you see, and which has the taste of wine, is not wine, but the blood of Christ.”^(x) *Ibid.* n. 2, 3. p. 293, 294.—“*Taste and see how good the Lord is.* Think you, now, that you are required to discern this by the sense of taste?^(y) No, by no means; but by the testimony of faith which is certain, and leaves no doubt. For when you take them, you are not commanded to take bread and wine; but under the appearance of these, to take the body and blood of Christ.” *Ibid.* Cat. v. n. 17. p. 300.

^(x) μη ἀπο της γευσεως κρινης το πραγμα, ἀλλ’ ἀπο της πιστεως πληροφορου ἀνενδοιαστως σώματος και αιματος Κριστου καταξιωθεις ταυτα μαθων και πληροφορηθεις, ὡς ὁ φαινομενος ἄρτος, οὐκ ἄρτος ἐστι, ἐι και τη γευσει, αἰσθητος, ἀλλὰ σωμα Κριστου, και ὁ φαινομενος ὀινος, οὐκ ὀινος ἐστιν, ἐι και ἡγε υςις τουτο βουλεται, ἀλλὰ ἅμα Κριστου.

^(y) Μη τῷ λαρυγγί τῷ σωματικῷ ἐπιτρεπητε το κριτικον;

S. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS,^(z) L. C.

“What is so sacrilegious as to break, to erase, and to remove the altars of God, on which you yourselves made offerings? On them the vows of the people, and the members of Christ were born.—For what is the altar, but the seat of the body and blood of Christ?^(a) What offence had Christ given, whose body and blood, at certain times, do there dwell?^(b) This huge impiety was doubled, when you broke also the chalices, the bearers of the blood of Christ.”^(c) *Contra Parmen*, L. vi. p. 91, 92, 93.—Among other excesses with which he charges the Donatists, he had before mentioned, that they ordered the consecrated elements to be poured out to dogs; which, seized with madness, turned against their masters, as against strangers, “guilty of the body of the Lord.”^(d) *Ibid.* L. ii. p. 39.

S. BASIL,^(e) G. C.

“About the things, that God has spoken, there should be no hesitation, nor doubt, but a firm persuasion, that all

^(z) *Milevis* was a city of Africa, of which St. Optatus was bishop about the middle of the fourth century. The work quoted was written against the Donatists, in seven books, addressed to Parmenianus, a bishop of that sect. It abounds with innumerable passages in favour of the unity, and other marks of the true church.

^(a) *Sedes et corporis et sanguinis Christi.*

^(b) *Cujus illic per certa momenta corpus et sanguis habitabat.*

^(c) *Calices, Christi sanguinis portatores.*

^(d) *Sancti corporis reos.*

^(e) *St. Basil*, surnamed the *Great*, for his admirable eloquence and profound erudition, was bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, and died about the year 379, leaving many valuable works.

is true and possible, though nature be against it.^(f) Herein lies the struggle of faith—*The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them: amen, amen I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.* (John vi. 53, 54.)—*Regula viii. Moral. T. ii. p. 240.*—“With what fear, with what conviction, with what affection of mind, should we partake of the body and blood of Christ? The apostle teaches us to fear, when he says: *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself* (1 Cor. xi, 29); while the words of the Lord: *This is my body, which shall be delivered for you* (ibid. 24.), create a firm conviction.”^(g) *Ibid. In Reg. brev. quæst. clxxii. p. 472.*—The Christian must be without spot or stain—and thus prepared to eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood.”^(h) *Ibid. in Moral. reg. lxxx. c. 22, p. 318.*—“It is very profitable, every day, to partake of the body and blood of Christ; ⁽ⁱ⁾ since he himself says; *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life* (John vi. 55).—We communicate four times in the week, on Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, and on other days, if there be a commemoration of any Saint.—At Alexandria, and in Egypt, the people, generally, have the communion in their houses, and they receive it as they judge proper, having received it from the priest.” *Ep. xcii. T. iii. p. 186.*—“What can be said of that person, who dares idly, and uselessly, to eat the body and drink the

(f) καὶ ἡ φύσις μαχεται.

(g) τὴν πληροφορίαν ἐμποιοῖ.

(h) οὕτως ἐσθῆν τῷ σωματι Κριστοῦ καὶ πίνειν τὸ αἷμα.

(i) μεταλαμβάνειν τὸ ἁγίον σωματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κριστοῦ.

blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,^(k) and thus sometimes more afflicts the divine spirit, while he eats without charity? Let us therefore judge, and not live to ourselves, but eat and drink to him, who died and rose again for us. It is the duty of him who approaches to the body and blood of Christ,^(l) and to the memory of his passion, not only to be pure from all defilement, but likewise to shew forth and express the remembrance of the death of Christ, lest he eat and drink to his own judgment.”^(m) *L. 1 de Bapt. c. 3. T. ii. p. 651.*—“ If he who was unclean under the old law, might not touch what was holy, how much more criminal is he who, in the impurity of his soul, rashly approaches to the body of our Lord.⁽ⁿ⁾ Let us therefore cleanse ourselves from all defilement.” *Ibid. L. ii. c. 3, p. 654.*

S. GREGORY OF NYSSA,^(o) G. C.

“ As that which is pernicious is admitted into our bodies, so should that which is salutary ; in order that the virtue of this latter may bring aid to us. When this

(k) φαγειν το σωμα, και πειν το αιμα τε Κυρις ημων.

(l) τον προσιοντα τη σωματι και τη αιματι τε Κριστε.

(m) The Benedictin Editors of St. Basil's works are of opinion, that these books on baptism are not his ; though of some ancient author. Combesis ascribes them to Eustatius of Sebaste—the contemporary of St. Basil.

(n) κατατολμων τε σωματος τε Κυρις.

(o) St. Gregory of Nyssa was the younger brother of St. Basil, like him, highly celebrated for his acquirements, and Bishop of Nyssa, on the confines of Cappadocia, in Asia Minor. His writings are numerous. He died late in the fourth century.

salutary medicine is within us, it repels, by its contrary quality, the poison we had received.—But what is this medicine? That body, which was shewn to be more powerful than death;^(p) and was the beginning of our life; and which could not otherwise enter into our bodies, than by eating and drinking.—Now we must consider how it can be, that that one body, which so constantly, through the whole world, is distributed to so many thousands of the faithful, can be whole in each receiver, and itself remain whole.^(q) The body of Christ, by the inhabitation of the word of God, was transmuted into a divine dignity: and so I now believe, that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is transmuted into the body of Christ.^(r) This bread, as the apostle says, is *sanctified by the word of God and prayer*, not that, as food, it passes into his body, but that it is instantly changed into the body of Christ, agreeably to what he said, *This is my body*.^(s) And therefore does the divine word commix itself with the weak nature of man, that, by partaking of the divinity, our humanity may be exalted. By the dispensation of his grace, he enters, by his flesh, into the breasts of the faithful, commixed and contempered with their bodies,^(t)

(p) οὐδεν ἕτερον ἢ ἐκεينو το σωμα, ὁ τῷ τε θανάτῳ κρείττον ἐδείχθη.

(q) πῶς ἐγένετο δυνατόν το ἐν ἐκεينو σωμα—ὅλον ἐν ἑκάστῳ, δια του μερὸς γενεσθαι, και ἑαυτο μενειν ἐφ' ἑαυτῳ ὅλον.

(r) και νυν τον τῷ λογῷ του θεου ἁγιαζομενον ἄρτον εἰς σωμα του θεου λογον μεταποιεσθαι πιστευομαι.

(s) ἐνθὺς προς το σωμα του λογον μεταποιουμενος, καθως εἰρηται ὑπο του λοῡγου, ὅτι τουτο ἐστι το σωμα μου.

(t) ἑαυτον ἐνσπειρει δια της σαρκος, οἷς ἡ συστασις ἐξ οἶνον τε και ἄρτου ἐστι τοις σωμασι των πεπιστευκοτων κατακίρναμενος.

that, by being united to that which is immortal, man may partake of incorruption." *Orat. Catech. c. 37, T. ii. p. 534, 535, 536.*—"The bread also is, at first, common bread; but, when it has been sanctified, it is called and is made the body of Christ."^(u) *Orat. in Bapt. Christi, T. ii. p. 802.*

S. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUM,^(x) G. C.

He says of his sister, labouring under a grievous disorder: "Despairing of all other help, she had recourse to the universal physician—She falls down in faith before the altar, and calls upon him who is there adored."^(y) *Orat. ii. T. 1. p. 186.*—"Without doubting, eat the body, and drink the blood,^(z) if thou desirest to live." *Ibid. Orat. xlii. p. 690.*

S. AMBROSE,^(a) L. C.

"The manna in the desert was given in figure. You

^(u) σωμα Χριστου λεγεται τε και γινεται.

^(x) *St. Gregory of Nazianzum* was the friend of *St. Basil*, with whom he studied at Athens; he became bishop of Constantinople, which see he afterwards relinquished, retiring to Nazianzum in Cappadocia, near which city he was born, and where he died, about the year 389. He was much celebrated for his eloquence, in which he is said to have excelled the greatest orators of the age; and of that eloquence many examples are yet extant in the various discourses or sermons, which form the principal body of his works.

^(y) τον ἐπ' αὐτῇ τιμωμενον.

^(z) ἀνεπαισχυντως και ἀνενδοιαστως, φαγε το σωμα, πιε το αιμα.

^(a) *St. Ambrose* died in the year 396, having held the see of Milan twenty years, with great profit to the church, edified by

have known things more excellent. For light is preferable to the shadow; truth to the figure; the body of Christ to the manna from heaven. But you may say: I see somewhat else; how do you assert, that I shall receive the body of Christ?—This remains to be proved.—How many examples may we not make use of to shew, that we have not here what nature formed, but what the divine blessing has consecrated, and that the virtue of this blessing is more powerful than that of nature; because by it nature itself is changed? Moses held the rod; he cast it on the ground, and it became a serpent. Again he took it by the tail, and again it became a rod. See you not that, by the prophetic power, the nature of the rod and the serpent was twice changed?”—He proceeds to instance many other miraculous changes, as recorded in Scripture, and then adds: “If now the blessing of men was powerful enough to change nature, what must we not say of the divine consecration, when the very words of our Lord operate? For that sacrament, which you receive, is accomplished by the word of Christ. If the word of Elias could call down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ be able to change the form of the elements?^(b) You have read concerning the creation of the world: *He spoke, and it was done; he commanded, and it was formed.* Therefore the word of Christ, which could draw out of nothing what was not, shall it not be able to change the things that are into that which they were not?^(c) For it is

his exalted virtues the western provinces, and instructed them by his writings. These are numerous, comprising *Commentaries* on many parts of Scripture, and moral Treatises.

^(b) Non valebit Christi sermo ut species mutet elementorum?

^(c) Sermo Christi—non potest ea quæ sunt, in id mutare quod non erant?

not a less effect of power, to give new existence to things, than to change the natures that were.—We will now establish the truth of the mystery, from the example itself of the incarnation. Was the order of nature followed, when Jesus was born of a virgin? Plainly, not. Then why is that order to be looked for here? It was the true flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried; and this is truly the sacrament of his flesh.—Our Lord himself proclaims: *This is my body*. Before the benediction of the celestial words, the bread (*species*) is named; after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified. He himself calls it his blood. Before consecration, it has another name; afterwards it is denominated blood. And you answer *Amen*; that is, it is true.^(d) What the mouth speaks, let the internal sense confess: what the words intimate, let the affection feel. By these sacraments, Christ feeds his church, and by them is the soul strengthened.”^(e) *De Initiandis*, c. ix. T. iv. p. 350, 351.—In the same chapter, he afterwards adds: *Taste and see how sweet the Lord is: blessed is the man who hopeth in him*. (Ps. xxxiii. 9.)

^(d) Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus: *Hoc est corpus meum*. Ante benedictionem verborum cælestium species nominatur; post consecrationem: corpus Christi significatur. Ipse dicit sanguinem suum. Ante consecrationem aliud dicitur; post consecrationem sanguis nominatur. Et tu dicis, *Amen*; hoc est, verum est.

^(e) The expressions of this passage are repeated, and more emphatically stated, in a succeeding treatise *On the Sacraments*, often quoted under the name of St. Ambrose; but as its authenticity is doubted by the most able critics, though it is admitted by them if not to be coeval with him, to be very ancient, I shall make no use of an uncertain authority. Still the authority proves what was the faith of the times in which the work was written.

Christ is in that sacrament, because it is the body of Christ: wherefore the food is not corporeal, but spiritual.^(f) Hence the apostle, speaking of its type (or figure) says: *Our fathers did eat the spiritual food, and did drink the spiritual drink.* (1 Cor. x.) For the body of God is a spiritual body. The body of Christ is the body of a divine spirit, because Christ is a spirit, as we read, *the Lord Christ is a spirit before our eyes.*" *Ibid.* p. 352.

ST. EPIPHANIUS.^(g) G. C.

"The Church is the tranquil port of peace, and daily distributes to us that drink which disperses care, the true blood of Jesus Christ."^(h) *In Acephalos*, T. ii. p. 152.

S. JEROME,⁽ⁱ⁾ L. C.

A lady, named Hedibia, had consulted the Saint on the

^(f) In illo sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi: non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritalis est.

^(g) St. Epiphanius was chosen bishop of Salamis, in the Isle of Cyprus, in 368, and was the author of many works, particularly against the reigning heresies of the time. The unity of faith was never more zealously maintained than in these early ages. He died in the beginning of the fifth century.

^(h) το λυσιπονον ἡμιν πομα καθ' ἑκαστην ἡμεραν, αἷμα Κυρίου χαρίζομενη, ἀκρατον, ἀληθες.

⁽ⁱ⁾ St. Jerome was the most eloquent, the most learned, and the most accomplished scholar of an age, which, in every branch of knowledge, could boast of men of eminence. His life, which began in 329, was protracted to 420, a space filled by him in various offices, in travelling, in retirement, and in increasing application. His works are numerous, and marked by a peculiar elegance of style. He never rose above the order of priesthood.

meaning of the passage in S. Matthew : *I say to you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my father.* He tells her, that the passage by some had been interpreted very sillily, and then adds : “ But not to trouble ourselves about such fables, let us acknowledge, that the bread which Christ broke, and gave to his disciples, is the body of our Lord and Saviour ;^(k) he saying to them : *Take and eat ; this is my body :* and of the cup ; *Drink ye all of this : this is my blood of the new Testament which shall be shed for many.*—If then the bread that came down from heaven is the Lord’s body, and if the wine, which he gave to his disciples, is his blood, which was shed for many for the remission of sins, let us reject those Jewish fables, and receive at his hand the cup of the new covenant. Moses gave us not the true bread, but our Lord Jesus did. He invites us to the feast, and is himself our meat : he eats with us, and we eat him. We drink his blood, and without him we cannot drink : we daily tread in the sacrifices the grapes that are red with his blood,^(l) and of these is the new wine in the kingdom of the father.” *Ep. cl. ad Hedib. T. l. p. 1219.* —“ The fatted calf, which is offered to obtain the salvation of repentance, is the Saviour himself, whose flesh we daily eat, and whose blood we daily drink.^(m) The reader, who is one of the faithful, understands as well as I do, what this nourishment is, which filling us with abun-

(k) *Esse corpus Domini Salvatoris.*

(l) *Ipse conviva, et convivium ; ipse comedens, et qui comeditur ; illius bibimus sanguinem, et quotidie in sacrificiis ejus, rubentia musta calcamus.*

(m) *Cujus quotidie carne pascimur, cruore potamur.*

dance, makes us put forth outwardly praises and holy thanksgivings.—The sacred feast is daily celebrated; ⁽ⁿ⁾ the father receiveth his son every day; Jesus Christ is continually offered upon the altars.”^(o) *Ep. cxlvi. ad Damas. T. 1. p. 1201.*—“There is as much difference between the loaves offered to God in the old law, and the body of Jesus Christ, as betwixt the shadow and the body, betwixt the image and the truth, and betwixt the types and the things they represent.—So let the mind, which prepares to form the body of Christ,^(p) be free not only from every unclean action, but from every indecent glance, every wandering of the mind.” *Comment. in Ep. ad Tit. c. 1. T. iii. p. 1045.*—“God forbid, that I should say any thing amiss of these men (priests) who, succeeding the apostles in their ministry, make the body of Jesus Christ with their sacred mouth.”^(q) *Ep. 1. ad Heliod. T. 1. p. 5.*—“After the typical passover was accomplished, and Christ had eaten the lamb with his apostles, he takes the bread, which comforteth the heart of man, and passes to the true sacrament of the passover; that as Melchisedec, priest of the high God, in prefiguring him, had done, offering bread and wine, Christ also should make present the truth of his body and blood.”^(r) *Comment. in Matt. c. 26. T. iii. p. 716.*

⁽ⁿ⁾ Hoc convivium quotidie celebratur.

^(o) Semper Christus credentibus immolatur.

^(p) Mens Christi corpus confectura.

^(q) Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt.

^(r) Ut quomodo in præfiguratione ejus, Melchisedec, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens, fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis repræsentaret. See *Perpétuité de la Foi*, T. ii. L. iii. c. v.

GAUDENTIUS OF BRESCIA,^(s) L. C.

Speaking of the paschal lamb among the Jews, and the manner in which it was distributed, he says: "But now, when the figure has ceased, the one that died for all, immolated in the mystery of bread and wine, gives life through all the churches, and, being consecrated, sanctifies those that consecrate. This is the flesh of the lamb; this is his blood:^(t) for the bread that came down from heaven said: *The bread, which I shall give you, is my flesh for the life of the world.* His blood is rightly expressed by the species of wine, because when he says in the gospel, *I am the true vine*, he sufficiently declares all wine, which is offered in the figure of his passion, to be his blood.^(u) And he who is the creator and lord of all natures, who produces bread from the earth; of the bread makes his own proper body, (for he is able, and he promised to do it;) and who of water made wine, and of wine his blood.^(x) *O the depth of the riches of the knowledge and wisdom of God!* (Rom. xi. 33.) It is the pasch,

^(s) He was ordained bishop of Brescia, in Italy, by S. Ambrose, towards the close of the fourth century; but the time of his death is not known. His works are comprised in nineteen discourses or sermons, written in a plain and easy style, from the second of which the above extract is taken.

^(t) Consecrantes sanctificat consecratus. Hæc agni caro; hic sanguis est.

^(u) Sanguinem suum esse omne vinum quod in figura passionis ejus offertur.

^(x) De pane rursus (quia et potest et promisit) efficit proprium corpus; et de vino sanguinem suum.

he says, that is the passover of the Lord; think not that earthly which is made heavenly by him, who passes into it, and has made it his body and blood.^(y) Believe what is announced to thee; because what thou receivest, is the body of that celestial bread, and the blood of that sacred vine;^(z) for when he delivered consecrated bread and wine to his disciples, thus he said: *This is my body; this is my blood.* Let us believe him whose faith we profess, for truth cannot lie.^(a)—Let us not break his solid and firm bone: *This is my body; this is my blood.* Now what remains in the sense of any one, which he does not conceive by this exposition, let it be consumed by the ardour of his faith.” *Tract. 11. in Exod. Bibl. PP. T. v. p. 946, 947. Edit. Lugduni, 1677.*

S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM,^(b) G. C.

“Elias left his garment to his disciple; but the Son of God left us his own flesh.^(c) The prophet in-

^(y) Ne terrenum putes, quod cæleste effectum est per eum, qui transit in illud, et fecit illud suum corpus et sanguinem.

^(z) Quod accipis, corpus est illius panis cælestis, et sanguis est illius sacræ vitis.

^(a) Credamus, quæso, cui credidimus. Nescit mendacium veritas.

^(b) *St. John Chrysostom*, was bishop of Constantinople, and received the appellation of *Chrysostom*, (the golden-mouthed) on account of his transcendant eloquence. His works are numerous; indeed, there is scarcely any subject, connected with religion that he has not illustrated. His Expositions of Scripture are particularly valuable. He died in the beginning of the fifth century, about the year 407. The edition of his works quoted is that of Paris, 1636.

^(c) την σαρκα ἣμιν κατέλιπε την ἑαυτη.

deed threw off his covering; but Christ ascending, took with him his body, and left it also for us.^(d) Let us not therefore repine nor fear any difficulties; for he who refused not to shed his blood for all, and communicated to us his body and blood, what will he not do for our salvation?" *Homil. ii. ad Pop. Antioch. T. 1. p. 37.*—"Let us then touch the hem of his garment; rather let us, if we be so disposed, possess him entire. For his body now lies before us, not to be touched only, but to be eaten and to satiate us.^(e)—And if they who touched his garment drew so much virtue from it; how much more shall we draw, who possess him whole?^(f)—Believe, therefore, that the supper at which he sat, is now celebrated; for there is no difference between the two. This is not performed by a man, and that by Christ; both are by him.^(g) When, therefore, thou seest the priest presenting the body to thee, think not that it his hand, but the hand of Christ that is stretched out towards thee."^(h) *Homil. li. in cap. xiv. Matt. T. vii. p. 553, 554.*—"Let us believe God in every thing, and not gainsay him, although what is said may seem contrary to our reason and our sight. Let his word overpower both.⁽ⁱ⁾ Thus let us do in mysteries; not looking only on the things that lie before us, but holding fast his words; for his word cannot deceive; but our sense is very easily deceived.^(k) That never failed;

(d) και ἡμῖν κατελίπε.

(e) ὥστε και φαγῆναι και ἐμφορηθῆναι.

(f) δι ὅλον αὐτον κατεχοντες.

(g) οὐδεν γαρ ἐκείνο τῆτι διενηνοχεν—ἀλλα και τῆτο κακεινο αὐτος.

(h) ἀλλα τῆν τε Κριστε χειρα εἶναι τῆν ἐκτεινομενην.

(i) ἀλλ' ἔστω και λογισμου και ὀψεως κυριωτερος αὐτου ὁ λογος.

(k) ὁ μεν γαρ λογος αὐτου ἀπαραλογιστος, ἡ δε αἰσθησις ἡμῶν εὐεξαπατητος.

this, often. Since then his word says, *This is my body*; let us assent, and believe, and view it with the eyes of our understanding. Christ left to us nothing *sensible* (no object of the senses); but things intellectual under *sensible* forms.^(d) Thus the blessing of baptism is given by water, which is corporeal; but what is done by it, namely the regeneration and renovation, is incorporeal or intellectual. If you were incorporeal, he would have bequeathed to you gifts purely incorporeal; but as your soul is united to a body, those gifts are to be comprehended under corporeal signs." *Homil. lxxxiii. in Matt. T. 7. p. 868.*—
 "How many persons are heard to say: I would willingly behold his figure, his shape, his attire! But thou seest him, thou touchest him, thou receivest him into thy breast.^(m) Yet thou desirest to see his garments. He gives himself to thee not to be looked on only, but to be touched, to be eaten, to be admitted into thy breast." *Ibid.*—"These are not the works of human power. He who in that supper made these things himself, now also does them for you. We hold the order of ministers; but the sanctifier and changer of them is himself."⁽ⁿ⁾ *Ibid. p. 870.*—
 "Who will give us of his flesh. that we may be filled? (Job xxxi. 31.) This Christ has done;—not only allowing himself to be seen, but to be touched too; and to be eaten, and teeth to pierce his flesh;^(o) and all to be filled with the love of him.—Parents often give their children to be nourished by others: Not so I, says Christ; but I nourish

^(d) οὐδεν αἰσθητον, ἀλλ' αἰσθητοῖς μὲν πραγμασι, πάντα δὲ νοητά.

^(m) ἰδου, αὐτου ὅρας, αὐτου ἅπτη, αὐτου ἐσθιεις.

⁽ⁿ⁾ ὁ δὲ ἁγιαζων αὐτά, καὶ μετασκεναζων, αὐτος.

^(o) ἀλλὰ ἐψασθαι καὶ φαγεῖν καὶ ἐπηξαι τῆς ὀδοντας τῇ σαρκί.

you with my flesh,^(p) and I place myself before you.—I was willing to become your brother; for the sake of you I took flesh and blood, and again I deliver to you that flesh and blood by which I become so related.”^(q) *Homil. xlv. in Ioan. T. viii. p. 292.*—“What sayest thou, O blessed Paul? Willing to impress awe on the hearer, and making mention of the tremendous mysteries, thou callest them the cup of benediction, (1 Cor. x. 16.) that terrible and tremendous cup.—That which is in the cup, is that which flowed from his side,^(r) and we partake of it.—It is not of the altar, but of Christ himself that we partake.—Let us, therefore, approach to him with all reverence and purity; and when thou beholdest the body lying before thee, say to thyself: By this body I am no longer earth and ashes—this is that very body which bled, which was pierced by the lance.”^(s) *Homil. xxiv. in Ep. ad Cor. T. x. p. 255, 257, 260.*—“He that was present at the last supper, is the same that is now present and consecrates our feast. For it is not man who makes the things lying on the altar become the body and blood of Christ, but that Christ who was crucified for us. The words are pronounced by the priest; but it is the power and grace of God that consecrate them. He said, *This is my body*: these words make the change.”^(t) *Homil. de*

(p) ταις σαρκί τρεφω ταις ἐμαίς.

(q) παλιν αὐτην ὑμιν την σαρκα και το ἅμα, δι' ὧν συγγενης ἐγενομην, ἐκδιδωμι.

(r) τουτο το ἐν ποτηριῳ ὃν, ἐκεينو ἐστι το ἀπο της πλευρας ῥευσαν.

(s) τωτο ἐκεينو το σωμα ἐστι, το ἡμαγμενον, το λογχη πληγεν.

(t) σχημα πληρων ἐστηκεν ὁ ἱερευς, τα ρηματα φθεγγομενος ἐκεινα· ἡ δὲ δυναμις, και ἡ χαρις τῷ θεῷ ἐστι. Τωτο μου ἐστι το σωμα, φησι· τωτο το ρημα μεταρρυθμιζει τα προκειμενα.

Prodit. Judæ. T. v. p. 415.—"As many as partake of this body, as many as taste of this blood, think ye it nothing different from that which sits above, and is adored by angels."^(u) *Homil. iii. in c. 1. ad Ephes. T. x. p. 885.*—"This table supplies the place of the manger, for even here shall lie the body of our Lord;^(x) not wrapped in swaddling cloths, as then, but surrounded on all sides by the Holy Spirit. They that are initiated understand these things. The Magi or wise men did nothing but adore; but if thou comest with a pure conscience, thou wilt be permitted to take him to thyself." *Orat. de S. Philogonio, T. 1. p. 357.*—"The servants of Job, to shew their love of him, said, *Who will give us of his flesh, that we may be filled.* (xxx. 31.) In like manner, Christ gave us his flesh, that with it we may be filled and inflamed with the love of him.—This body lying in the manger the wise men revered, seeing no such thing as thou seest: thou dost not see him in the manger, but on the altar—nor dost thou only see him, but moreover thou touchest him; nay thou eatest him, and returnest home with him in thy breast."^(y) Cleanse then thy soul from all defilement, and prepare thyself to receive these mysteries." *Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. T. x. p. 261, 262.*—"Wonderful! The table is spread with Mysteries, the lamb of God is slain for thee, and the spiritual blood flows from the sacred table. The spiritual fire comes down from heaven; the

(u) ἐγνοείτε ὅτι τῇ μηδὲν ἐκείνου διαφέροντες, οὐδὲ διεστώτος μετεχόμεν, ὅτι ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἄνω καθημένῳ τῷ αὐτογενομένῳ.

(x) ἡ γὰρ τραπέζῃ ἕστη, ταξιν τῆς φατνῆς πληροὶ· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐνταῦθα κείσεται τὸ σῶμα τὸ δεσποτικόν.

(y) οὐχ ὅρας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπτή· καὶ οὐχ ἀπτή μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐσθίεις, καὶ λαβῶν οὐκαδὲ ἀναχωρεῖς.

blood in the chalice is drawn from the spotless side for thy purification.—Thinkest thou that thou seest bread? that thou seest wine? that these things pass off as other foods do? Far be it from thee to think so.⁽²⁾ But as wax brought near to the fire loses its former substance, which no longer remains: so do thou thus conclude that the mysteries (the bread and wine) are consumed by the substance of the body. Wherefore, approaching to them, think not that you receive the divine body from a man, but fire from the hand of the Seraphim.”—*Hom. de Panit. seu de Euchar. in Encæniis. T. v. p. 489.*

There is a letter, written to the monk Cæsarius, and ascribed to this prelate, wherein he says, refuting the monk's opinion, that the divinity and humanity in Christ were so mixed, as to form but one nature: “Jesus Christ is God and man; God as impassible, man as having suffered. Yet is there one only Son and one Lord: one and the same, who, by the union of the natures, has one domination and one power; although these natures are not consubstantial; for each one retains, without mixture, the characters which distinguish it. The natures are united without being confounded. For as (in the Eucharist) before it is sanctified, the bread is called bread; but when the divine grace, by means of the priest, has consecrated it, it is freed from the appellation of bread, and is esteemed worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the *nature* of bread remains in it, and we do not say, there are two bodies, but one body of the Son: so here, the divine nature being joined to the human, they both together form but one Son, one person; yet it must

(2) μη ὅτι ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἰδῆς, μηδ' ὅτι οἶνος ἐστὶ νομίσῃς—ἀπαγε, μη τὸτο νοεῖ.

be acknowledged, according to an unconfused and indivisible manner, not in one nature, but in two perfect natures." ^{a)} *Ep. ad. Cæsarium. p. 22. Paris, 1689.*

S. MARUTHAS, ^(b) G. C.

" *Do this in remembrance of me.* This was necessary and very proper: for if the perpetual participation of the

(^a) Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus; divinâ autem illum sanctificante gratiâ, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est Dominici corporis appellatione, etsi *natura* panis in eo permansit, et non duo corpora, sed unum corpus filii prædicatur: sic et hic, divinâ insidente corporis naturâ, unum filium, unam personam, utraque hæc fecerunt: agnoscendum tamen inconfusam et indivisibilem rationem, non in unâ solum naturâ, sed in duabus perfectis.

The Greek original of this letter is not extant, and the Latin translation seems imperfect; but what difficulty there may be in the word *nature*, applied to the bread after consecration, should be explained by the other passages from the same father, which clearly express the real change of substance. From other ancient writers, such as Gelasius of Rome, and Theodoret of Cyrus in Syria, both of the fifth century, passages, similar to that above, are adduced, wherein the word *natura*, and the Greek equivalents, *φύσις* and *οὐσία*, are used, in comparisons from the Eucharist, to denote the external qualities of bread and wine, which before and after consecration remain the same. See *Perpétuité de la Foi: T. iii.* and on the authenticity of the Letter to Cæsarius, *Dupin Bibliot. T. iii. Cave Hist. Lit. p. 267, and Montfaucon T. iii. Op. S. Chrysostomi, p. 736.* To my own apprehension the Letter is manifestly spurious.

(^b) *St. Maruthas* was bishop of Tagrit, in Mesopotamia, and began to flourish about the end of the fourth century. He compiled

sacraments had not been delivered, whence could we have learnt salvation through Christ; or by whose persuasion have been led to the knowledge of so great a mystery? To the bulk of mankind it would have been most difficult to be believed; and thus they would have been deprived of the communion of the body and blood of Christ. But now, as often as we approach, and receive on our hands the body and blood, we believe, that we embrace his body, and become, as it is written, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone. For Christ did not call it the figure or the species of his body, but he said: *This truly is my body, and this is my blood.*"^(c) *Com. in Matt. apud. Assemani, Bibl. Orient. T. 1. p. 180. Romæ, 1719.*

CENT. V.

S. AUGUSTIN,^(d) L. C.

"As you know the sacrifice of the Jews, according to the rite of Aaron, consisted in the offerings of beasts, and

the Acts of the Martyrs who suffered in the persecution of Sapor, from 340 to 380, and wrote some commentaries on St. Matthew, and other works, in Syriac. He was the friend of St. Chrysostom, but survived him many years. He died before the middle of the fifth century.

^(c) *Figuram et speciem ejus haud ipsum appellavit, sed dixit, hoc verè est corpus meum, et hic est sanguis meus.*

^(d) *St. Augustin* was bishop of Hippo in Africa, and himself an African. His works are very numerous, and his name, on account of the erudition of those works, their vast researches, and their deep insight into all the ways of the divine economy,

this in mystery : as yet the sacrifice of the body and blood of the Lord was not, which the faithful understand,^(e) and they who have read the gospel ; which sacrifice is now diffused through the whole world." *In Psal. xxxiii. T. viii. p. 92.*—"Wherefore the sacrifice of Aaron was taken away ; and that, according to the order of Melchisedec, commenced.—Our Lord was willing, that our salvation should be in his body and blood. And this was an effect of his humility. For had he not been humble, he would not have been to us meat and drink."^(f) *Ibid.*—"When, committing to us his body, he said : *This is my body*, Christ was held in his own hands. He bore that body in his hands."^(g) *Ibid. p. 94.*—"Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, said the psalmist to God. For the ancients, when as yet the true sacrifice was foretold in figures, celebrated the type of what was to come.—Those sacrifices, therefore, signifying promises, were annulled : and what was given to complete those promises? That body, which you know ; which all do not know ; and which, it were to be wished, some did not know to their condemnation."^(h)

has ever borne the greatest weight in the Christian churches. He illustrated the close of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century, in the Latin church, while St. Chrysostom shone in the east. He died in the year 430.

(e) Nondum erat sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Domini, quod fideles norunt.

(f) Nec manducaretur, nec biberetur.

(g) Ferebatur Christus in manibus suis, quando, commendans ipsum suum corpus, ait : *Hoc est corpus meum*. Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis.

(h) Corpus quod nostis ; quod utinam qui nostis omnes, non ad judicium noveritis.

This was promised by certain signs: but when the promised truth came, the signs were taken away. In this body we subsist; of this body we are made partakers; ⁽ⁱ⁾ we know what we receive." *In Psal. xxxix. Ibid. p. 142, 143.*—"Christ took upon him earth from the earth; because flesh is from the earth, and this flesh he took from the flesh of Mary: and because he here walked in this flesh, even this same flesh he gave to us to eat for our salvation; ^(k) but no one eateth this flesh, without having first adored it; and not only we do not sin by adoring, but we even sin by not adoring it." ^(l) But is it the flesh that quickeneth? The Lord even, in exalting this earth to us, informs us, that it is *the spirit that quickeneth*, and that *the flesh profiteth nothing*. Wherefore in abasing yourself, and in casting yourself down before any matter whatever, consider it not as matter, but consider in it that Holy one, of whom the body, which you adore, is the footstool. For it is for his sake that you adore it." *In Psal. xcvi. Ibid. p. 452.*—"The man Christ Jesus, though in the form of God, he receive sacrifice with his father, with whom he is one God, yet in the form of a servant he chose rather to be himself the sacrifice than to receive it; lest, even on this occasion, any one should imagine, that sacrifice might be offered to a creature. Thus is he the priest, himself offering, and himself the victim. It was his will, that the Church's sacrifice should be the daily sacrament of this oblation; ^(m) which Church, as it is the body united to its

⁽ⁱ⁾ Hujus corporis participes sumus.

^(k) Et ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit.

^(l) Nisi prius adoraverit—et non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando.

^(m) Per hoc et sacerdos est; ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio.—Cujus rei sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit Ecclesiæ sacrificium.

head, learns to offer herself through him. The ancient sacrifices of the Saints were the manifold and various signs of this true sacrifice.—And to this high and true sacrifice all others gave way.” *De Civit. Dei, L. x. c. 20, T. v. p. 605.*—Speaking of the Jews converted by S. Peter, he says: “They were converted; they were baptised; they approached to the table of the Lord; and now believing, they drank that blood, which in their rage they had shed.”⁽ⁿ⁾ *Serm. lxxvii. De Verb. Evang. T. v. p. 420. Ed. Bened. Paris. 1679.*—“You ought to understand what you have received; what you are about to receive; and what you ought every day to receive. The bread that you behold on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is the body of Christ. That cup—that which the cup contains, sanctified by the word of God, is the blood of Christ.”^(o) By these the Lord was willing to set forth his body and that blood which he shed for us for the remission of sins.” *Serm. ccxxvii. al. lxxxiii. In die Pasch. ad Infantes. T. x. p. 555. Edit. Paris. 1614.*—“We receive with a faithful heart and mouth, the mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus; who has given us his body to eat, and his blood to drink; although it may appear more horrible to eat the flesh of a man than to destroy it, and to drink human blood than to spill it.”^(p) *Contra Advers. Legis, L. ii. c. ix. T. vi. p. 264.*—“We have heard our master, our divine Redeemer, recommending to us the price of our redemption—his own blood. For he spoke to us of his body and blood: his

⁽ⁿ⁾ Sanguinem, quem sævientes fuderunt, credentes biberunt.

^(o) Panis ille, quem videtis in altari, corpus est Christi. Calix ille—immo quod habet calix, sanguis Christi est.

^(p) Quamvis horribiliùs videatur humanam carnem manducare, quam perimere, et humanum sanguinem potare, quam fundere.

body, he said, was food; his blood was drink.^(q) They who believe, acknowledge here the sacrament of believers. But some were scandalised, saying, *This is hard; who can hear it?* Jesus answered: *Doth this scandalise you? If then you shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before?* (John vi.) What does this mean, *doth this scandalise you?* Did you think, that I was going to divide into parts this body that you see: to cut these members, and give them to you? What then if you shall see the Son of man ascending where he was before? Truly, he that could ascend entire, could not be consumed. Wherefore of this body and blood he gave us a salutary banquet,^(r) and, in a few words, solved the question concerning the entireness of his body.—Eat then what is life; drink what is life, and thou shalt have life. And this will be, that is, the body and blood of Christ will be life to each one, if what is visibly taken in the sacrament, be truly eaten spiritually, and drunken spiritually. For we have heard the Lord himself declare: *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life.* (John vi.) But some say, *This is hard; who can hear it?* It is hard to the hard, that is, it is incredible to the incredulous.^(s) *De Verbis Apostoli, Serm. ii. T. x. p. 94.*—“In what sense do we understand the words of Christ: *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him?* (John vi.) Can we extend this to those, of whom the

^(q) Locutus est nobis de corpore et sanguine suo: corpus dixit escam, sanguinem potum.

^(r) De corpore ac sanguine suo dedit nobis salubrem refectionem.

^(s) Durus est, sed duris; hoc est, incredibilis, sed incredulis.

apostle says, that they eat and drink judgment to themselves, although they eat the very flesh, and drink the very blood of Jesus Christ?^(d) Shall we likewise say that Judas, who betrayed his master, abode in Christ and Christ in him, because with the other disciples he partook of the first sacrament made by the hands of Christ himself? Shall we say that they, who eat and drink with a hypocritical heart, or who afterwards apostatize, abide in Christ and he in them? There is a way of eating this flesh and drinking this blood, of which it is true to say, that he who thus eats and drinks, abideth in Jesus Christ, and he in him.—To this way our Saviour directed his view.” *Serm. xi. de Verbis Dom. T. x. p. 18.*—“To abide in Christ, and to have him abiding in us, this is to eat that food, and drink that drink. Wherefore, he that abideth not in Christ, and has not Christ abiding in him, plainly eats not spiritually his flesh, nor drinks his blood; although carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: he rather eats and drinks judgment to himself.” *Tract. xxvi. in Ioan T. ix. p. 94.*—“Our Saviour taught us this in mystic words—but many who were present not understanding this, were scandalized; for hearing him, they thought of nothing but their own flesh.—He therefore said, *The flesh profiteth nothing*; that is, it profiteth nothing as they understood it; for they understood it to mean flesh as it is in a dead body, or as it is sold in the market, not as animated by life.”^(u) *Tract. xxvii. Ibid. p. 95, 96.*—Speaking of his

^(d) Cum ipsam carnem manducant, et ipsum sanguinem.

^(u) Carnem sic intellexerunt, quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur, aut in macello venditur; non quomodo spiritu vegetatur.

mother's death, he says: "She desired that remembrance of her should be made at the altar, a service which on no day she had omitted; knowing that thence was dispensed the holy victim, by which the hand-writing against us had been blotted out." *L. ix. Confess. c. 13. T. 1. p. 69.*

S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA,^(x)

"*I am the living bread that came down from heaven.* (John vi. 51.) The manna, he says, was the type, was the shadow, and the image. He aragain how openly and plainly he speaks: *I am the living bread; if any one shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.* They that ate of the manna are dead, because it gave not life. He that eats this bread, that is, me or my flesh, shall live for ever."^(y) *Comment. in Ioan. L. iv. T. iv. p. 352.*—"Our Lord Jesus, by his own flesh,^(z) gives life to us, and inserts, as it were, in us the seed of immortality, destroying all the corruption that is in us.—And his blood is not that of any common man, but the natural blood of life itself.^(a) Wherefore, receiving the Son within us, we are called the body and members of Christ." *Ibid. p. 363, 364.*—"For he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. (John vi. 56.) As he that joins wax to

^(x) *St. Cyril* of Jerusalem was patriarch of Jerusalem, and died about the year 385. The works, which he has left, in twenty-three *Catechetical Discourses*, form a full and very accurate abridgment of Christian doctrine.

^(y) τὸ ἐστὶν ἐμε, ἡτοί την σαρκα την ἐμην.

^(z) δια της ἰδιας σαρκος.

^(a) αἷμα γὰρ ἐστὶν οὐχ ἑνος των τυχόντων ἀπλως, ἀλλ' αὐτης της κατα φύσιν ζωης.

wax, forms of them one body ; so it seems to me, he that eats the flesh of our Saviour, and drinks his precious blood, as himself says, becomes one with him ; by this participation being commixed and incorporated with him, so that he be found in Christ, and Christ in him.”^(b) *Ibid.* p. 365.—And what is the meaning and the efficacy of this mystic eucharist? Is it not that Christ may corporeally dwell in us by the participation and communion of his holy flesh?^(c)—It is here proper to observe, that Christ does not say that he will be in us only by a certain regard of affection, but by a natural participation.^(d) For as he that shall melt wax upon wax, forms one body of two ; so by partaking of the body and blood of Christ he is in us, and we are united to him.”^(e) *Ibid.* L. x. p. 862, 863.—“The Son therefore is in us corporally as man, commixed and united to us by the mystic eucharist;^(f) but spiritually as God, by the virtue and grace of his spirit, renovating our own spirit in us, and making us partakers of his life and divine nature.—By the mediation of Christ, therefore, we enter into an union with God and the

^(b) ὡπερ γὰρ εἰ τις κήρον ἕτερω συναψείη κήρω, παντως δῆπε καὶ ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ γεγονότα κατοψεται· τον αὐτον, οἶμαι, τροπον, καὶ ὁ την σαρκα δεχομενος τε σωτηρος ἡμῶν Χριστε, καὶ πινῶν αὐτε το τιμιον αἷμα, ἐν ὡς προς αὐτον ἐυρισκεται συνανακιρναμενος ὡπερ καὶ ἀναμιγνυμενος αὐτῷ δια της μεταληψεως, ὡς ἐν Κριστῷ μεν αὐτον ἐυρισκεσθαι, Χριστον δε αὐ παλιν ἐν αὐτῷ.

^(c) τη μεθεξει καὶ κοινωνίᾳ της ἀγίας αὐτε σαρκος.

^(d) ἀλλὰ δε κατα μεθεξιν φυσικαν.

^(e) οὕτω δια της μεταληψεως τε σωματος τε Χριστε, καὶ τε τιμῇ αἱματος, αὐτος μεν ἐν ἡμῖν, ἡμεῖς δε αὐ παλιν ἐν αὐτῷ συνενουμεθα.

^(f) σωματικος μεν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, συνανακιρναμενος τε καὶ συννευμενος δι' εὐλογίας της μυστικης.

father, receiving him within us, corporally and spiritually,^(g) who, by nature, and truly, is the Son, and consubstantial with him; and thus are we glorified, being made partakers of, and associated, to the supreme divine nature." *Ibid. L. xi. p. 1001, 1002.*—"Let those verbose and absurd men tell us, with whose body the sheep of the church are fed, or from what springs her children are refreshed? For if the body of God is delivered, this God is the true God, Christ the Lord, not a mere man, nor an angel, as some pretend. And if it be the blood of God, the cup of God, this God is not purely God, one of the adorable Trinity, the Son of God, but the word of God made man. But if the body of Christ be our food, and the blood of Christ be our drink,^(h) and this Christ be a mere man, how is eternal life promised to those who approach to the holy table? And how again, shall this body be divided here, and in many places, and not be diminished? A mere body cannot impart life to those who receive it.—Wherefore, let us receive the body of life itself: that life, which for us has dwelt in our body; and let us drink his sacred blood for the remission of our sins, and to partake of that immortality which is in him; believing Christ to be the priest and the victim, the offerer and the offered."⁽ⁱ⁾ *Hom. in Mysticam Cœnam. T. v. parte ii. p. 378.*

COUNCIL OF EPHESUS, G. C.

The following extracts are from an epistle of S. Cyril,

(g) λαβοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ σωματικῶς καὶ πνευματικῶς.

(h) εἰ δὲ Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἢ βρωσῖς, καὶ Χριστὴ ἅμα ἢ ποτὶς.

(i) μεταλαμβάνωμεν ἡμεῖς τῆς ἀντοζώσης σῶμα—καὶ πινώμεν αὐτοῦ το ἅμα το ἅγιον—πιστευόντες ὅτι περ αὐτοῦ μένει ἱερεὺς καὶ θύσια; αὐτοῦ ὁ προσφέρων καὶ προσφερόμενος.

and an Egyptian Synod, read in the general council of Ephesus, in 431, and approved by the council, as conveying the belief of the universal church. They write to the heresiarch Nestorius.—“ On this occasion it is our duty to add, that while we announce the death of Jesus, the only Son of God, and his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, we likewise celebrate the unbloody sacrifice in the churches, approach to the mystic thanksgivings, and are thus sanctified, being made partakers of the sacred flesh and precious blood of Christ, the Saviour of all men. For we receive it not as common flesh: far be this thought from us: ^(k) nor as the flesh of a sanctified man, and united to the word by an equality of honour, nor as having obtained a divine inhabitation; but we receive it as the truly vivifying flesh of the word made man. For as the word, as God, is essentially life, the moment it became one with its flesh, it imparted to this flesh a vivifying virtue. Wherefore, although Christ said: *Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you*; (John vi. 53.) we are not to imagine, that it is not the flesh of a man like to ourselves, but truly the flesh of him who for us was made and called the Son of man. For how could the flesh of man, according to its own nature, give life?” *Ep. ad Nest. Conc. Gen. T. iii. p. 404.*—In confirmation of this doctrine, they then add the following anathema: “ He that does not confess the flesh of the Lord to be vivifying, and the proper flesh of the word of God made man; but

(k) την ἀναμακτον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τελουμένην θυσίαν, προσίμεν τε ὄντω ταῖς μυστικαῖς ἐνλογίαις, καὶ ἁγιαζόμεθα, μετοχοὶ γενομένοι τῆς τε ἁγίας σαρκὸς, καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος τοῦ παντῶν ἡμῶν σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ. καὶ οὐχ ὡς σάρκα κοινὴν δεχομένοι μὴ γενοίτο.

to be the flesh of some other, united in dignity to the word, or that has obtained only a divine inhabitation; and shall not acknowledge that flesh to give life, as we have said, because it is the flesh of the word that gives life to all things, let him be anathema." *Ibid.* p. 409.

THEODOTUS,⁽¹⁾ G. C.

In his sermon on the birth of Christ, which was read in the same Council of Ephesus, he says: "He who at that time, by his ineffable power, drew the Magi to godliness, has also this day called us together; not now lying in a manger, but placed before us on this saving table; for that manger was the parent of this table.^(m) For this reason was he laid there, that on this table he might be eaten, and become to the faithful the food of salvation."⁽ⁿ⁾ And that manger indeed represented this glorious table." *Ibid.* p. 1004.

S. ISAAC,^(o) G. C.

"I saw the vessel mingled, and in place of wine, full of

⁽¹⁾ *Theodotus* was bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, and assisted at the Council of Ephesus, in 431.

^(m) ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς σωτηριῶδους τραπέζης ταύτης προκειμένος.

⁽ⁿ⁾ ἵνα ἐπὶ ταύτης βρωθῇ, καὶ γενῇται τοῖς πιστοῖς σωτηριὸν ἔδεσμα.

^(o) *St. Isaac* was a priest of Antioch, and flourished under Theodosius the younger, about the middle of the fifth century. Some account of him and his works may be seen in the first volume of the "*Bibliotheca Orientalis*" of Jos. Assemani. The above sermon is mentioned by Gennadius, who died about 493.

blood; and the body, in lieu of bread, place on the table.^(p) I saw the blood, and shuddered; I saw the body, and was awed with fear. Faith whispered to me; Eat, and be silent; drink, child, and enquire not.^(p)—She showed me the body slain, of which placing a portion on my lips, she said, gently: Reflect what thou eatest. She held out to me a reed, directing me to write. I took the reed; I wrote; I pronounced: This is the body of my God. Taking then the cup, I drank.—And what I had said of the body, that I now said of the cup: This is the blood of my Saviour.”^(r) *Serm. de Fide. Bibl. Orient. T. 1. p. 220. Romæ, 1731.*

S. PETER CHRYSOLOGUS,^(s) L. C.

“ Let Christians understand, who every day touch the body of Christ,^(t) what helps they may draw from that body, when the woman was perfectly cured by only touching the hem of his garment.” *Serm. xxxiv. p. 872. Edit Lugduni, 1676.*—“ *I am the bread that came down from heaven: He is the bread which, sown in the womb of the virgin,*

^(p) Pro vino, sanguine plenam; et pro pane, positum corpus in medio mensæ.

^(q) Commede et sile: bibe, non scrutare, puer.

^(r) Confessus sum, hoc esse Dei corpus—hunc esse Redemptoris nostri sanguinem.

^(s) He was placed on the archiepiscopal chair of Ravenna about the year 430, and governed that church about twenty years. We have 176 of his discourses, which were so much esteemed in those days as to procure him the surname of *Chrysologus*.

^(t) Qui quotidie corpus Christi attingunt.

and finally brought on our altars, daily affords celestial food to the faithful.”^(u) *Serm. lxvii. p. 899.*—“ In what manner the body of Christ should be eaten, and his blood drunken,^(x) they understand, who are instructed in the heavenly sacraments.” *Serm. xcvi. p. 920.*

S. PROCLUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE,^(y) G. C.

“ By these prayers (of the liturgy) the descent of the Holy Spirit was expected, that, by his sacred presence, he would make the bread that is presented for the offering, the body of Christ, and the wine, mingled with water, his blood.”^(z) *In Bibl. PP. Max. T. vi. p. 618.*—“ The solemn day of the sacred mysteries arrived: the evening came, more bright than any day. For, on this evening, all is full of admiration and awe. The Lord sat down with his disciples, and laid open before them the scene of mysteries. He gave to them for food his pure body; and drink for the remission of sins.”^(a) *Orat. x. in S. Feriam v. T. 1. p. 406. In Novo Auct. Combesis, Paris, 1648.*

^(u) Qui satus in virgine—illatus altaribus, cælestem cibum quotidie fidelibus subministrat.

^(x) Quemadmodum manducetur caro Christi; quomodo libatur et sanguis ejus.

^(y) St. Proclus was the disciple of St. Chrysostom, and was placed on the patriarchal chair of Constantinople, in 434. He died in 447. Several of his homilies and letters are still extant.

^(z) Ut efficeret ipsum illud corpus, et sanguinem Domini.

^(a) δέδωκε βρωμα την αναμαρτητον σαρκα· ἀμαρτηματων σπογγον ἱχαρισατο πομα.

S. LEO,^(b) L. C.

“ To the end that the shadow might give way to the reality, and, in the presence of truth, that representations might cease, the ancient observances are now [at the passion of Christ] annulled by a new sacrament, the victim passes into another victim, blood excludes blood,^(c) and the legal festival, by being changed, is fulfilled.—The disciples, being seated with their master to eat the mystic supper, while the Jews held council how they might kill him, Jesus ordained the sacrament of his body and blood,^(d) teaching what victim was to be offered to God; nor did he refuse the mysterious banquet to the traitor Judas.” *Serm. vii. de Passione Dom. p. 259.*—“ The participation of the body and blood of Christ^(e) causes us to pass into that which we receive; whence being dead, and buried, and rising again in him, we carry him about with us in spirit, and in our flesh.” *Serm. xiv. p. 284.*—“ Denying in Christ the reality of a human body, these men make void the truth of his passion and resurrection. And so immersed are they in the shades of ignorance, as not to

^(b) *St. Leo*, on account of his exalted virtues and signal government of the church, acquired the appellation of *Great*; while the works which he has left, comprising numerous sermons and letters, prove the solidity of his judgement, the extent of his acquirements, and the firmness of his courage on many trying occasions. His style is at once elevated and elegant. He died in 461.

^(c) Hostia in hostiam transit, sanguine sanguis aufertur.

^(d) Corporis et sanguinis sui ordinavit sacramentum.

^(e) Participatio corporis et sanguinis Christi.

have learned either by hearing or by reading what, in the church of God, is so universally acknowledged, that even the tongues of infants proclaim, in the sacrament of our common faith, the truth of the body and blood of Christ.^(f) For in the mystic distribution of this spiritual food, we receive the virtue of the celestial aliment, and are transformed into his flesh, who took our flesh upon him.^(g) *Ep. xlvi. Al. xxiii. p. 518.*

THEODORET,^(h) G. C.

He wrote four books against the Eutychians, who denied the reality of the human nature in Christ, in which he introduces two persons, under the names of *Orthodoxus* and *Eranistes*, who discuss the subject. The first, it is plain, is the Catholic believer. In the first dialogue the

(f) In Ecclesia Dei in omnium ore tam consonum est, ut nec ab infantium linguis veritas corporis et sanguinis Christi inter communionis sacramenta taceatur.

(g) Ut in carnem ipsius, qui caro nostra factus est, transeamus.

(h) *Theodoret* is best known as the author of the "Ecclesiastical History," which begins in 322, where Eusebius finishes, and comes down to 428. He was bishop of Cyrus, a city of Syria;—was connected with many of the great men of the age, and was involved with them in various controversies. He found time, however, for study; for few men have written more, and this with so extensive a knowledge of all the subjects which he treats, scriptural, moral and historical: hence, it has been said of him, that he equally deserved praise as an able interpreter of Scripture, a profound divine, an acute controvertist, a learned apologist, and an accurate and eloquent historian. He died at an advanced age, about the year 457, if not later.

reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist had been established; and, in the second, the subject is resumed, and the change of the bread and wine more distinctly pointed out.—*Orth.* Now: tell me the mystical symbols, which are offered to God by the priests, of what are they the symbols?—*Eran.* Of the body and blood of the Lord.—*Orth.* Of his true body, or not?—*Eran.* Of his true body.⁽ⁱ⁾—*Orth.* Very well; for every image must have its original.—*Eran.* I am happy you have mentioned the divine mysteries. Tell me, therefore; What do you call the gift that is offered before the priest's invocation?—*Orth.* This must not be said openly; for some may be present who are not initiated.—*Eran.* Answer then in hidden terms.—*Orth.* We call it an aliment made of certain grains.—*Eran.* And how do you call the other symbol?—*Orth.* We give it a name that denotes a certain beverage.—*Eran.* And after the consecration what are they called?—*Orth.* The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ.^(k)—*Eran.* And you believe that you partake of the body and blood of Christ?—*Orth.* So I believe.—*Eran.* As the symbols, then, of the body and blood of Christ were different before the consecration of the priest, and after that consecration are changed;^(l) in the same manner we (Eutychians) say, the body of Christ, after his ascension, was changed into the divine essence.—*Orth.*

(i) τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶματος τε καὶ αἵματος.—τὸ ὄντος σῶματος, ἢ οὐκ ὄντος;—τὸ ὄντος.

(k) μετὰ δεγε τοῦ ἁγιασμον—? σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

(l) τὰ συμβόλα τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶματος τε καὶ αἵματος, ἄλλα μὲν εἰσι πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐπικλήσιν μεταβαλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται.

Thou art taken in thy own snare ; for, after the consecration, the mystical symbols lose not their proper nature : they remain in the former substance, figure, and appearance (or rather, in the shape and form of the former substance),^(m) to be seen, and to be felt, as before ; but they are understood to be what they have been made ; this they are believed to be ; and as such they are adored." *Dial. ii. T. iv. Edit. Paris. 1642.*

S. PROSPER,⁽ⁿ⁾ L. C. :

" He receives the food of life, and drinks the cup of eternity, who dwells in Christ, and Christ in him. For he that departs from Christ, eats not his flesh, nor drinks his blood, though he daily take to his own condemnation that august sacrament."^(o) *In Sententiis. p. 596. Edit. Paris. 1711.*

SYLVIANUS,^(p) L. C.

" The Jews ate manna ; we Christ : they the flesh of

^(m) μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτερας οὐσίας, καὶ τὸ σχήματος, καὶ τὸ εἶδος.
—The word *προτερας*, (*former*) seems to imply the second translation.

⁽ⁿ⁾ *St. Prosper* was a learned layman of Aquitain, and contemporary with *St. Augustin*, in whose defence he wrote several works, which are extant. He died about the year 456.

^(o) Nec carnem ejus manducat, nec sanguinem bibit ; etiamsi—quotidie indifferenter accipiat.

^(p) *Sylvianus* was a learned priest of Marseilles, who flourished from about the middle, to the end of the fifth century ; and of whom we have eight books " On the Government of God," and four books " Against Avarice,"

birds; we the body of God: they the dew of heaven; we the God of heaven.”^(q) *Adv. Avaritiam*, L. ii. p. 246. *Edit. Paris*. 1684.

S. NILUS,^(r) G. C.

“ Before the prayer of the priest, and the coming of the Holy Spirit, the things laid on the table are common bread and wine; but after the solemn invocations, and the descent of the adorable spirit, it is no longer bread, and no longer wine, but is the body, and pure and precious blood, of Christ, the God of all.”^(s) *Ep.* xliv. L. 1. p. 21.—“ Let us not approach to the mystic bread as to mere bread, for it is the flesh of God, the venerable, adorable, and life-giving flesh.”^(t) *Ep.* xxxix. L. iii. p. 322.

Avarice,” addressed to the Catholic Church, under the name of Timotheus; besides some epistles. Baluze published them, together with the “Commonitorium” of Vincent of Lerins, at Paris, 1684.

^(q) Nos Christum,—nos corpus Dei—nos Deum cœli.

^(r) *St. Nilus* was a disciple of the great *St. Chrysostom*. After having been governor of Constantinople, he retired into the desert of Sinah, and there led a solitary life. He flourished under the emperors Arcadius and Theodosius, and died about 451. He has left us several treatises, and a great number of letters on religious subjects.

^(s) οὐκ ἐστι ψιλον ἄρτον, καὶ κοινον δινον τὰ ἐπιτεθειμενα τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπεζῇ, ἀλλ’ σωμα, καὶ αἷμα τιμιον, καὶ ἀχραντον Κριστε, τῷ Θεῷ των ἀπαντων.

^(t) μη ὡς ψιλῷ ἄρτῳ προσερχωμεθα τῷ ἄρτῳ τῷ μυστικῷ, σαρεῖ γὰρ ὑπαρχει Θεοῦ, σαρεῖ τιμια, καὶ προσκυνητη, καὶ ζωοποιος.

GELASIUS,^(u) L. C.

Having quoted Theodoret, I shall give a similar passage from Gelasius, who is also writing against the same Eutychians :—" Certain sacraments of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, which we receive, are something divine, and render us partakers of the divine nature ; but the substance or nature of the bread and wine ceases not to be. In the holy mysteries are celebrated the image and resemblance of the body and blood. Hence we are sufficiently informed, that what we believe, and celebrate, and receive under that image, we must believe to be in Christ himself. And as, by the operation of the divine Spirit, the things pass into the divine substance, though their nature retains its properties ; so are we thus taught, that the mystery of the Incarnation consists in this, that the two natures remaining, there is but one Christ, who is one, because he is whole and entire."^(x) *Libel. contra Nest. et Eutych. ap. Baron. an. 496. T. vi. p. 665. Edit. Moguntiae, 1601.*

^(u) *St. Gelasius* succeeded to Felix II. in 492, and held the Roman see about five years. He has left us several letters and treatises.

^(x) The authenticity of this piece has been strongly contested ; but let the decision be what it may, it is plain, that the words *nature* and *substance*, applied to the bread and wine after consecration by Gelasius, and the equivalent Greek words *φύσις* and *οὐσία*, used by Theodoret in the preceding quotation, mean not what, in their present acceptation, is understood by them. They both assert, that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ ; therefore, when they add that the nature and substance of both

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Our Saviour, in leaving to us his body and blood, under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice; a commemorative sacrifice, distinctly shewing his passion and death until he come. For as the sacrifice of the cross was performed by a distinct effusion of his blood, so is that sacrifice commemorated in this of the altar, by a distinction of the symbols. Jesus, therefore, is here given not only to us, but for us; and the church is thereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, usually termed the Mass: propitiatory we say, because representing in a lively manner the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the sacrifice of the cross.

still remain, they must mean the *external* or *sensible* qualities. They may be *seen* and *felt*, says Theodoret, as before. The authors of the learned work, *Perpétuité de la Foi*, Vol. III., prove this by many examples drawn from ecclesiastical and profane writers, as well as from the obvious context of the passages themselves. Should it, however, be conceded, that there is an ambiguity in the expressions, or even that the authors of them meant to convey a sense, in our estimation, heterodox, how light must their authority be, when balanced against the massive evidence of so many writers of their own age and of the preceding centuries!

SCRIPTURE.

As the bloody sacrifices ordained by the Jewish law, are understood to have prefigured the sacrifice which the Redeemer of Mankind was once to offer on the cross, by the effusion of his blood; so do we believe that the unbloody offerings of the same law, but much more than these, the bread and wine, which Melchisedec, "*the priest of the most high God*," presented to Abraham, (Gen. xiv.) were a type or figure of that unbloody sacrifice, which Christ, *the priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec*, (Ps. cix.) would continue to offer, through all ages, under the symbols or species of bread and wine.

Malach. i. 10, 11. *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand.—For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering.*—Matt. xxvi. 28. *This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many^(y) for the remission of sins.*—Mark xiv. 24. *This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many.^(y)*—Luke xxii. 19. *This is my body that is given for you:^(z) do this for a commemoration of me.*—20. *This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.*—1 Cor. xi. 24. *This is my body which is broken for you:^(a) this do for the commemoration of me.*—25. *This chalice is the New Testament in my blood; do ye this as often as you shall drink it, for the commemoration of me.*—26. *For as often as you shall*

(y) το ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον. (z) το ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δίδομενον.

(a) το ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλωμενον.

eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come.

According to the translation of these passages, which is conformable to the Greek, our Saviour speaks in the present tense (or time) of the actual immolation of his body, and the actual effusion of his blood *for the remission of sins*; because at that moment, he really, but *mystically*, offered up his body and blood for the salvation of the apostles and of all men; while the words, *do this for a commemoration, or in remembrance of me*, plainly denote the institution of a sacrifice to be celebrated to the end of time. Thus Christ seems to say: As I now immolate my body and shed my blood for the remission of sins; so do you offer up this same body and this same blood in remembrance of me. What I now do, do you and your successors.—In this sense, as we have seen, and shall see, have the words of Christ always been understood in the Catholic church.

1 Cor. x. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. *Wherefore, my dearly beloved, fly from the service of idols.—I speak as to wise men; judge ye yourselves what I say.—The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?—For we being many are one bread, one body all that partake of one bread.—Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not they that eat of the sacrifice, partakers of the altar?—What then? Do I say that what is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? Or that the idol is any thing?—But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils.—You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.*

As the apostle speaks of the participation of the victims among the Jews, which were offered on their altars, and of a similar participation among the Gentiles ; so, instituting a comparison, he plainly speaks of Christians partaking of the body and blood of our Lord from the Eucharistic altar.

Heb. xiii. 10, 11, 12. *We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle.—For the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.—Wherefore, Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.*

The meaning of the passage is not plain, but it seems to intimate the superiority of the Christian worshippers. Not only the Jews, but even their priests, were not allowed to taste of the victims which were solemnly offered for sin ; whereas we have an altar and a victim, typified by those of the Jews, of which we may at all times partake : a victim once offered for sin, and represented by the daily oblation of his body and blood.

Acts xiii. 2. *And as they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them.—The breaking of bread is often mentioned in the same Acts ; and in the two quotations just given from St. Paul, the altar and table^(b) are mentioned, which must refer to sacrifice.—Rev. v. 6. And I saw : and behold in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the ancients, a lamb standing as it were slain.—8. And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty ancients, fell down before the lamb.—9. And they sung a new canticle, saying ; Thou*

(b) θυσιαστηριον—τραπέζη.

art worthy, O Lord, to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God in thy blood, out of every tribe and tongue, and people and nation.—10. And hast made us to our God a kingdom and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.

FATHERS.

CENT. I.

S. CLEMENT OF ROME, L. C.

“Whatever God has commanded to be done at stated times, that we must perform in regular order; thus must our offerings be made, and other public functions exercised;^(c) not inconsiderately and without order, but as it was ordained, at stated times and hours. They, therefore, who in this manner present their offerings,^(d) are acceptable to the Lord and blessed; for, following his commandments, they do not go astray.” *Ep. 1. ad Cor. n. 40. T. 1. PP. Apost. p. 170.*

CENT. II.

S. JUSTIN, L. C.

“Inflamed by the word of his calling, as it were, by

(^c) τας τε προσφορας και λειτουργιας ἐπιτελεισθαι.

(^d) τας προσφορας αυτων.

fire, truly we are the sacerdotal offspring of God; as he himself attests, saying, that in every place among the nations, we offer to him well-pleasing and clean victims. These victims he accepts from his own priests alone. Wherefore, shewing preference to all those who through his name, offer the sacrifices which Christ ordained to be offered; that is, in the eucharist of bread and the chalice,^(e) which in all places of the earth are celebrated by the Christian people, God declares that they are well-pleasing to him. But the sacrifices of you Jews, and of your priests, he rejects, saying: *I will accept no offering from your hands; because from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, but ye have profaned it.* Malach. 1.—But I myself say that those prayers and thanksgivings are alone perfect, and the victims pleasing to God, which are offered by good men. These Christians alone have learned to offer in the commemoration of their dry and liquid food^(f) (bread and wine) in which commemoration they are reminded of the passion which Christ suffered.” *Dial. cum Tryphon. Judæo*, p. 386.

S. IRENÆUS, L. C.

“Giving advice to his disciples to offer their first fruits to God, not as if he stood in need of them, but that they might not seem ungrateful, he took bread into his hands, and giving thanks, said, *This is my body.* Likewise he declared the cup to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the new Testament, which oblation the church

(e) ἐν τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τὰ ἄρτια καὶ τὰ ποτήρια.

(f) τῆς τροφῆς αὐτον ἔφαρς τε καὶ ὕγρας.

receiving from the apostles, offers it to God over all the earth,^(g)—to him who grants us food—the first fruits of his gifts in the new Testament, of which the prophet Malachias spoke: *I will not accept offerings from your hands. For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, a clean sacrifice.* (l.) Manifestly hereby signifying, that the first people (the Jews) will cease to offer to God; and that in every place a sacrifice, and that clean, will be offered to him,^(h) and that his name is glorified among the gentiles.”⁽ⁱ⁾ *Adver. Hær. L. iv. c. xxxii. p. 323, 324.*—“Therefore the offering of the church, which the Lord directed to be made over all the world, was deemed a pure sacrifice before God,^(k) and received by him; not that he stands in need of a sacrifice

(g) Calicem—suum sanguinem confessus est, et novi Testamenti novum docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo.

(h) Omni autem loco sacrificium offeretur ei, et hoc purum.

(i) On this passage, the learned Editor of Irenæus, Dr. Grabe, observes: “It is certain that Irenæus and all the fathers—either contemporary with the apostles, or their immediate successors, whose writings are still extant—considered the blessed Eucharist to be the sacrifice of the new law, and offered bread and wine on the altar, as sacred oblations to God the Father; and that this was not the private opinion of any particular church or teacher, but the public doctrine and practice of the universal church, which she received from the apostles, and they from Christ, is expressly shewn in this place, by Irenæus, and before him by Justin M. and Clement of Rome.”—*Nota in Irenæum, p. 323.*

(k) Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri—purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum.

from us, but because he that makes the offering, if his gift be accepted, is thereby rendered worthy of praise.—As then in simplicity the church offers, her offering is accepted by God as a pure sacrifice.—It is our duty to make an offering, &c. *See above, p. xx.—Ibid. c. xxxiv. p. 326, 327.*

TERTULLIAN, L. C.

“It was ordained in the old law, That no sacrifices should be offered to God, but in the land of promise, which the Lord was to give to the children of Israel; and that when they entered, sacrifices and holocausts should there be celebrated. Why then does the spirit declare by his prophets, that in all the earth, and in every place, sacrifices shall be offered? *In every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering.* (Malach. 1.)—As then it is plain, that a temporary Sabbath was appointed, and an eternal Sabbath predicted; a carnal and spiritual circumcision; a law that would pass away, and a law to endure for ever; carnal sacrifices likewise, and spiritual sacrifices promised: from this it follows, that all these things being commanded to the Jewish people, the time would come when they would cease, and the promise of a new law, with spiritual sacrifices, and a new Testament would take their place.” *Adversus Judæos, c. v. vi. p. 139.*—The same he repeats against Marcion, *L. iii. p. 679.*—But it would seem, that he alludes principally to the pure sacrifices of the heart, and not to the establishment of a real sacrificial offering. In other parts of his works, however, I meet with expressions which evidently pertain to a sacrifice—such as *altars, offerings* for the dead, the duty of priests to *offer*, and annual *oblation* of husbands and wives for their departed consorts.

CENT. III.

S. CYPRIAN, L. C.

Writing to the clergy and people of a certain district in Africa, he laments that, contrary to an established rule, a brother clergyman had been appointed, by will, an executor or guardian, when it was the sole duty of the ministers of the gospel "to attend to the altar and sacrifices,^(l) and to prayers and supplications." Such, likewise, he observes, was the view of the Almighty in the establishment by Moses of the Levitical order, and then adds: "The same disposition holds good now, that they who are promoted by clerical ordination, be not called away from the service of God, nor perplexed by worldly business; but, receiving aliment from their brethren, they withdraw not from the altar and from sacrifices,^(m) day and night intent on heavenly things."—He next remarks that, in a case like this, it had been decreed, that for no brother, who by will had made such a disposition, "any offering should be made, or sacrifice celebrated for his repose:⁽ⁿ⁾ because he merits not to be named at the altar in the prayer of the priests, whose wish it was to withdraw them from the altar." He, therefore, forbids prayers and oblations to be made for him. *Ep. 1. p. 1, 2, 3.*—"Although I am sensible, that most bishops, set over the churches of God, hold to the maxims of evangelical truth and divine tradition, and depart not, by any

(l) Altari et sacrificiis deservire—debeant.

(m) Ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant.

(n) Nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur.

human and innovating discovery, from that which Christ our master taught and did; yet as some, through ignorance or simplicity, in the sanctification of the cup of the Lord, and in delivering it to the people, do not that which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the teacher and founder of this sacrifice,^(o) himself did and taught; therefore, I judge it necessary to write to you, in order that, if there be any one still in that error, he may, when he sees the light of truth, return to the root and fountain of Christian tradition."—Then proceeding to the point, he says: "Be then advised, that, in offering the cup, the rule ordained by Christ, be followed; that is, that the cup, which is offered in commemoration of him, be wine mixed with water. For as he said: *I am the true vine*; not water, but wine, is the blood of Christ. And what is in the chalice cannot be thought the blood, by which we obtained redemption and life, if wine be wanting, whereby that blood is shewn, which, as all the scriptures attest, was shed." *Ep. lxiii. p. 148.*—"In the priest Melchisedec we see prefigured the sacrament of the Christian sacrifice,^(p) the holy scriptures declaring: *Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God, and he blessed Abraham.* (Gen. xiv.) And that he bore the resemblance of Christ, the Psalmist announces: *Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec.* (Ps. cix.) This order thus comes and descends from that sacrifice; that Melchisedec was the priest of the Most High; that he offered bread and wine; and that he blessed Abraham. And who was so

(o) Sacrificii hujus auctor et doctor.

(p) Sacrificii Domini sacramentum.

much a priest of the most High God, as our Lord Jesus Christ? He offered sacrifice to God the Father; he offered the same as did Melchisedec, that is, bread and wine, his own body and blood: and the blessing given to Abraham, now applies to our people.”—“ But, in the book of Genesis, that the blessing given to Abraham might be properly celebrated, the representation of the sacrifice of Christ, appointed in bread and wine, precedes it; which our Lord, perfecting and fulfilling, himself offered in bread and wine; and thus he who is the plenitude, fulfilled the truth of the prefigured image.” *Ibid.* p. 149.—He afterwards adds: “ If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the high priest of his father; and if he first offered himself a sacrifice to him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of him; then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did, and then offers in the church a true and complete sacrifice to God the Father,^(g) doing what he ordained. For the whole discipline of religion and of truth is subverted, if that which was commanded be not faithfully complied with.” *Ibid.* p. 155.

I could quote many other passages from the Letters of S. Cyprian, and from his other Tracts, in which he speaks of the Christian sacrifice of the New law, in terms the most plain and obvious, such as: “ We are mindful of you day and night, and when we offer up prayer in the sacrifices.” *Ep.* xxxvii. p. 72.—“ As often as we celebrate the anniversary days of the martyrs, we offer sacrifices for them [the relatives of Celerinus].” *Ep.* xxxix.

(g) Ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesiâ Deo Patri.

p. 77.—“To God and his Christ, whom I serve, and to whom, with a pure and undefiled countenance, in persecution and in peace, I unceasingly offer sacrifices.”^(r) *Ep.* lxvi. p. 169.—“Whilst we were offering sacrifice,^(s) the girl was brought in by her mother.” *De Lapsis*, p. 132.

CENT IV.

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA, G. C.

“And as he (speaking of Melchisedec), who was the priest of the Gentiles, seems never to have offered animal sacrifices, but wine alone and bread, while he blessed Abraham; so our Saviour and Lord first, and then the priests who are descended from him, performing, in all nations, according to ecclesiastical ordinances, the sacerdotal function, represent, in bread and wine, the mysteries of his body and salutary blood,^(t) which mysteries Melchisedec had so long before by the divine spirit foreknown, and used in figure. The scripture of Moses says: *And Melchisedec, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God: and he blessed Abraham.*” (Gen. xiv.) *Demonst. Evang. L. v. c. iii. p. 223. Colonizæ*, 1688.—“Since then, as the new Testament,” &c. *See the passage, p. xxx of this Appendix.*

S. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, G. C.

He mentions the various prayers and ceremonies which

^(r) *Sacrificia indesinenter offero.* ^(s) *Sacrificantibus nobis.*

^(t) ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἡ ἄρτος, τότε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος ἀντιτίθενται ταῖς μυστηρίαις.

accompany our sacrifice of the altar, and adds: "When this spiritual sacrifice, this unbloody worship over the victim of propitiation, is ended,^(u) we supplicate God for the common peace of the churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their armies and their allies, for the sick and the afflicted; and in a word, for all who want assistance. Again, when we offer this sacrifice, we commemorate those who have departed this world before us.—We offer up that Christ who was slain for our sins, that he who is most kind, may be propitious to us and them."—He proceeds to the Lord's prayer which is recited in the Mass, and dwells on its several clauses; and then prescribes the reverential manner in which the body and blood of Christ are to be taken. *Catech. Mystag.* v. n. 6, 7. p. 297, 298.

S. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUM, G. C.

"And where, and by whom, could God be worshipped in those mystic and elevating sacred rites, than which nothing among us is greater nor more excellent, if there were no priesthood nor sacrifice?^(x)—Knowing this, and knowing besides that no one was worthy of this great God, this sacrifice, and this priesthood, who had not first offered himself a victim to the Lord—how should I dare to offer to him that external sacrifice,^(y) that antitype of great mysteries, or to take up the name and habit of a

(u) πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναιμακτὸν λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τῷ ἱλάσμῳ.

(x) οὐδὲ ἱερατείας, οὐδὲ θυσίας.

(y) θυσίαν—τὴν ἐξωθεν, τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντιτυπον.

priest?" *Orat.* 1. *T.* 1. *p.* 3, 38.—" Julian, in impure and wicked blood, washes away his baptismal rite, opposing initiation to initiation—he defiles his hands in order to purify them from that unbloody sacrifice^(z) through which we communicate with Christ, with his divine nature, and his sufferings." *Orat.* iii. *in Julian.* *T.* 1. *p.* 70.

S. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS, L. C.

See the quotation from him, *p.* xxxix, of this Appendix.
 " What is so sacrilegious," &c.

S. AMBROSE, L. C.

Commenting on the appearance of the angel to Zacharias, (Luke 1.) he says : " It were to be wished, that while we burned incense on our altars, and offer sacrifice, the angel would assist and become visible to us. That he does assist, cannot be doubted, while Christ is there, while Christ is immolated ;^(a) *For Christ our pasch is sacrificed.*" (1 Cor. v.) *L.* 1. *in Evang. Luc.* c. 1. *T.* iii. *p.* 12.—" We have beheld the prince of priests coming to us; we have beheld and heard him offering his blood for us; let us priests then follow him as we can, and offer sacrifice for the people, weak as we are in merit, but rendered honourable by this sacrifice; for although Christ is not now seen to offer, yet is he offered on earth, when his body is the victim.^(b) Indeed, he manifestly offers in us, since it his

(z) της ἀναιμακτῆ θυσίας ἀποκαθαιρων.

(a) Quando Christus assistit, quando Christus immolatur.

(b) Ipse offertur in terris, quando Christi corpus offertur.

word that sanctifies the sacrifice that is offered." *Enarr. in Psal. xxxviii. T. ii. p. 740.*

In a letter to his sister Marcellina, giving an account of some disturbances at Milan, when an attempt was made to seize the church, he relates: "The next day, which was Sunday, after the reading and sermon, when I was explaining the creed, word was brought that officers were sent to seize the Portian church, and that part of the people were flocking thither. I continued to discharge my duty, and began Mass;^(c) but as I was offering, I was informed that the people had laid hands on an Arian priest. This made me weep, and I prayed to God in the midst of the offering,^(d) that no blood might be shed in this quarrel." *Ep. xiv. T. v. p. 205.*—Having heard from the emperor Theodosius, of the victory which he had gained over the tyrant Eugenius, Ambrose writes to him. "I took your letter with me to the church; I laid it on the altar; and whilst I offered sacrifice^(e) I held it in my hand, that by my voice you might speak, and your august letter perform with me the sacerdotal office." *Ep. lviii. T. v. p. 322.*

As the *Mass* has just been mentioned in a quotation from S. Ambrose, I will here subjoin a passage on the subject, from the learned and pious cardinal Bona, who flourished at Rome in the seventeenth century.—"There is an epistle of Pius I., acknowledged to be genuine, written about the year 166 to the bishop of Vienne, in the opening of which he thus speaks: 'Our sister Euprepia, as you well recollect, made over her house to the poor, where we dwell and celebrate Mass.'" *Conc. Gen. T. 1. p. 576.*—

(c) Missam facere cæpi. (d) Et orare in ipsâ oblatione.

(e) Cum offerrem sacrificium.

A letter also from pope Cornelius to another bishop of the same city, written about the year 254, remarks that on account of the persecutions, the Christians could not publicly "celebrate Mass." *Ibid.* p. 681.—In the fourth century, St. Ambrose writing to his sister, mentions the mass, as likewise in his thirty-fourth Discourse: "I exhort you, you that are near the church, and can do it without great inconvenience, to hear Mass daily." *T.* v. p. 48.—In his preparatory prayer before Mass, he says; "Grant me thy grace on this day, and on every other, with a pure mind and clean heart, to celebrate the solemn service of Mass."^(f) *Ibid.* p. 335.—"St. Augustin and other ancient fathers use the same expression, and they use it as if it were common and generally received at the time." *L.* 1. *Rerum Liturg.* c. iii. p. 17. *Edit. Paris*, 1678.

In this fourth century, various Councils were held, which in plain terms speak of the Christian sacrifice.

COUNCIL OF ANCYRA,^(g) G. C.

Against such priests who, in the times of persecution, had shown great weakness, it enacts: "That they be not deprived of their stations; but that they be not allowed to offer,^(h) nor to address the people, nor to perform any priestly function." *Can. 1. Conc. Gen. T. 1.* p. 1455.

^(f) The two works quoted by Cardinal Bona, as productions of St. Ambrose, are not allowed, by the learned, to be his, though of some ancient author.

^(g) This council, held about the year 314, consisted of bishops from all the principal sees of the East, to the number of, at least, 118.—They enacted twenty-five canons for the establishment of discipline.

^(h) προσφέρειν.

COUNCIL OF NEOCÆSAREA, ⁽ⁱ⁾ G. C.

“Country-priests, in the presence of the bishop, or the priests of the city, cannot *offer*,^(k) nor give the sanctified bread, nor present the chalice. *Ibid. Can. xiii. p. 1483.*

COUNCIL OF NICE,* G. C.

“The holy Synod has been informed that, in some places and cities, the deacons present the Eucharist to the priests. This thing no canon nor custom has taught—that they, who have themselves no power to *offer*,^(l) should present the body of Christ to those who possess that power.” *Can. xviii. Conc. Gen. T. ii. p. 38.*

COUNCIL OF LAODICEA,^(m) G. C.

Having established certain rules to be observed in the service of the church, it adds: “And after the priests have given the kiss of peace to the bishop, the laity must do the same one to the other, and thus the holy *offering*”⁽ⁿ⁾ be completed: but the ministers alone may approach the altar, and there communicate.” *Ibid. Can. xix. p. 1499.*

⁽ⁱ⁾ This council was called soon after that of Ancyra, and consisted of nearly the same bishops.

^(k) προσφέρειν. ^(l) προσφέρειν.

* Held in 325, against the errors of Arius.

^(m) This council met about the middle of the fourth century, and has left us sixty canons, which have ever been held in the greatest estimation.

⁽ⁿ⁾ την ἁγίαν προσφοράν.

SECOND COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE,^(o) L. C.

It enacts that, if any priest, having been reprimanded by his bishop, withdraw from his communion, and “offer sacrifice privately,^(p) erecting altar against altar, contrary to established discipline—he be deprived of his office.” *Ibid. Can. viii. T. ii. p. 1161.*

THEOPHILUS OF ALEXANDRIA.^(q) G. C.

“Let the priests, after certain portions have been consumed in the use of the mysteries, divide the remainder of what was offered in the way of sacrifice;^(r) but of them the catechumen may not eat nor drink, but clerks only, and the believing brethren with them.” *In Commonit. Can. vii. Apud Bevereg. p. 172. Edit. Oxonii, 1672.*

S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, G. C.

On the words of the prophet Malachias; *And in every place incense shall be offered to God, and a clean offering;*

^(o) This council was called by Genethlius, bishop of Carthage, who presided at it, in 390. It enacted thirteen canons, respecting the celibacy of bishops, priests, and deacons, and other points of discipline.

^(p) Separatim—sacrificium Dei obtulerit.

^(q) He succeeded Timotheus, and sat on the patriarchal chair of Alexandria, from 385 to 412. Some of his letters are to be found among those of St. Jerome, and in Beveredge's “Canons of the Greek church.”

^(r) τα προσφερόμενα εἰς λόγον θυσίας.

he says, addressing the Jews: "When did this happen? When was incense thus offered? When this clean sacrifice? You can produce no other time than this, after the coming of Christ.^(s) And if of this time the prophet had not spoken; had he prophesied, not of our sacrifice but of that of the Jews, his prophecy would have been contrary to the law: for Moses forbids sacrifices to be offered in any other place than that which God had chosen: to this he confines them. But Malachias declares, that in *every place* incense shall be offered, and a clean sacrifice. In truth, however, there is no discordance between them. They speak of different sacrifices.—In the first place, the prophet foretels that, not in one city, as among the Jews, but from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, offerings shall be made. Then, by calling the sacrifice *clean*, he plainly denotes of what victim he spoke. And finally, the offerings will be made, not in Israel, but in all nations. In *every place*, says he; evidently showing, that wherever the sun sheds its light, there the gospel shall be preached. He speaks of a *clean offering*, not as if, by its own nature, that of the Jews had been unclean, but only through the will of the offerers. Wherefore God said: *their incense is an abomination to me*. Nevertheless, if our present sacrifice be compared with the former, so vast will the difference be found, that ours alone can merit the name of clean." *Adv. Judæos, Orat. iii. T. 1. p. 437.*—"The office of priesthood is, indeed, performed on earth, but it should itself be referred to the class and order of things celestial.—Wherefore, it is necessary that the priest be pure, as if,

(s) οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις ἕτερον εἶπεν καιρον, ἀλλ' ἡ τῆτον, τον μεγα την τε Κριστη παρεσαν.

placed in heaven, he stood among the celestial spirits.—For when you behold the Lord immolated, and the priest at the altar offering sacrifice, and pouring out prayers, and then the surrounding multitude partaking of the sacred blood,^(t) can you, at that moment, fancy you are among mortals, and dwelling on the earth? Rather, are you not transported to the heavens? *De Sacerd. L. iii. c. iv. T. iv. p. 27.*—“But when the priest shall have invoked the Holy Spirit, and shall have completed this tremendous and awful sacrifice, the common Lord of all being handled by him;^(u) I ask you, in what rank shall we place him? And what integrity of life, and what sense of religion shall we not demand from him? Reflect, what those hands should be; what the tongue, that utters those words; how pure and holy the soul that has been so honoured. Meanwhile, the angels stand by the priest, the army of heavenly powers cry out, and the space around the altar is filled by them in honour of him who lies there.” *Ibid. L. vi. c. iv. p. 82.*—These sentiments he often repeats.—“He has ordained a sacred rite, changing the victim, and, in the place of animals, commanding himself to be immolated.”^(x) *Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. T. x. p. 256.*—“It was not in vain that the apostles ordained that, in the celebration of the tremendous mysteries, mention should be made of the dead. They knew that great advantage would thence be derived to them. For all the people being present, and raising

(t) τον κυριον τεθυμενον και κειμενον, και τον ιερεα εφεστωτα τῷ θυματι—και παντας εκεινη τῷ τιμῇ φοιτισσομενους αιματι.

(u) τον φρικωδεστατην επιτελη θυσιαν, και τα κοινα παντων συνεχως εφαπτηται δεσποσε.

(x) την ιερουργιαν μετεσκευασε, και την θυσιαν αυτην αμειψας, και αντι της αλογων σφαγης, εαυτον προσφερειν κελευσας.

their hands to heaven, and the sacred victim lying there,^{y)} shall not God be rendered propitious to them?" *Hom. iii. in c. 1. Ep. ad Philip. T. xi. p. 32.*—"But do we not (it may be asked) offer sacrifice daily?" We do; but in remembrance of his death. And the victim is one, not many. But how is this? Because it was once offered and brought into the sanctuary. This sacrifice is a copy of that; the offering is the same. Not one on one day, and on the next another; but always the same.^(z) Thus then the sacrifice is one. But are there many Christs, as the offering is made in many places? By no means: it is the same Christ every where; here entire and there entire; one body. As then, though offered in many places, there is one body, and not many bodies: so is there one sacrifice. He is our high priest, who offered the victim of our expiation: that same victim we now offer that was then offered; which cannot be consumed. This is done in remembrance of what was done. *Do this, he said, in remembrance of me.*" *Hom. xvii. in c. x. Ep. ad Hebr. T. xi. p. 856.*

S. INNOCENT I,^(a) L. C.

He writes to the bishop of Eugubium: "You say that the kiss of peace is sometimes given before the sacred mysteries are completed, which should not be done till after those parts which I must not reveal; for that kiss

^{y)} προκειται ἡ φρικτὴ θυσία.

^(z) τον γὰρ αὐτον αἰε προσφερομεν· οὐ γυν μὲν ἕτερον, ἄντριον δὲ ἕτερον, ἀλλὰ αἰε το αὐτο· ὥστε μια ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία.

^(a) *St. Innocent* succeeded *Anastasius*, in 402, and governed the church of Rome till 417. Thirty-three of his letters are extant.

denotes that the faithful present have assented to all that was performed." He gives other directions, speaking of "the sacred mysteries, and the victim that is offered." *Ep. ad Decentium: Conc. Gen. T. ii. p. 1246.*

S. JEROME, L. C.

"*I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord; neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun,*" &c. Malach. 1.—It is a fixed rule when a prophecy manifestly refers to future events, not to weaken it by uncertain allegories. The present prophecy regards the Jewish priests who brought improper victims to be offered, to signify to them that spiritual victims would succeed to carnal; and that not the blood of bulls and goats, but perfumes, that is, the prayers of the saints, should be offered to God; and that, not in one province, nor in one city; but a clean oblation in every place, such as is offered in the Christian ceremonies: *For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, great is my name among the Gentiles.*" *In cap. 1. Malach. T. iii. p. 544.*

Having stated what were the opinions of many learned men on the character and offering of Melchisedec, (Gen. xiv.) he says: "The apostle affirms, that the priesthood of Aaron, that is, the Jewish priesthood, *had a beginning and an end* (Heb. vii.); but that the priesthood of Melchisedec, that is, of Christ and his church, should be eternal, and had no author; and that *the priesthood being translated, it is necessary that a translation also be made of the law.*" *Ep. cxxvi. ad Evagrium, T. 1. 1060.*—I find him, on many occasions, expressing the same sentiment: that the offering of bread and wine by Melchisedec, was a type of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ in the ele-

ments of bread and wine, and thus dedicated the Christian mystery in the blood and body of our Saviour.”^(b) *Ep. ad Marcel. T. iii. p. 151.*—“According to thee, the Roman bishop does wrong, who offers sacrifices to the Lord, over the bodies of Peter and Paul, which bodies we call venerable remains, but you, vile dust. To him their tombs are altars.” *Adv. Vigilantium, T. 1. p. 591.*—Having treated, at great length, of the superior virtues of the state of celibacy, he says: “And if the lay-man, or any one of the faithful, is not able to pray, unless he be continent; it is the duty of the priest, who is constantly to offer sacrifices for the people, always to pray; but if always to pray, then to be continent.”^(c) *L. 1. Adv. Jovinianum, T. 1. p. 487.*—He gives the same advice to bishops: “What must be our opinion concerning the bishop, who daily, for his own and the sins of the people, is to offer to God pure sacrifices?” *In c. 1. Ep. ad Titum, T. iii. p. 1045.*

CENT. V.

S. AUGUSTIN, L. C.

“Then Abraham (Gen. xiv.) was blessed by Melchisedec, the priest of the most high God, of whom many and great things are said in the epistle to the Hebrews: (vii.) which epistle most people ascribe to the apostle Paul,

^(b) This letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, written to induce her to repair to Bethlem, is generally supposed to have been penned by St. Jerome.

^(c) Si semper orandum, ergo semper carendum matrimonio.

though some deny it. Then first appeared that sacrifice, which is now offered to God by Christians through all the earth;^(d) and that is fulfilled which, long after the fact of Melchisedec, was said of Christ by the prophet: *Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec.* (Psal. cix.) Not according to the order of Aaron; for this order was to be annulled, when the things, which those shadows prefigured, should come to pass.” *De Civ. Dei. L. xvi. c. xxii. p. 1019.*—“This eating and drinking, of which the wise man speaks, (Eccles. iii.) relate to the participation of this table, which the mediator of the new covenant, the priest, according to the order of Melchisedec, offers of his body and blood. This sacrifice has succeeded to all those of the ancient covenant, which were offered, as the shadows of this that was to come.” *Ibid. L. xvii. c. xx. p. 1138.*—“The prophet Malachias foretelling the church, which we now behold propagated by Christ, thus manifestly speaks to the Jews in the person of God: *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, neither will I accept an offering at your hand.—For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering.* (Malach. 1.) Since then we behold this sacrifice, in every place, offered to God by the priesthood of Christ,^(e) according to the order of Melchisedec; and as the Jews cannot deny that their sacrifices have ceased, why do they still look for another Christ?” *Ibid. L. xviii. c. xxxv. p. 1210.*

Speaking afterwards in reply to those who asked, why

(d) Quod nunc a Christianis offertur Deo toto orbe terrarum.

(e) Hoc sacrificium per sacerdotiam Christi, cum in omni loco videamus offerri.

miracles were not then wrought; he recounts many, to most of which he was himself a witness, and among them relates, that the property of a great man, whom he names, having been much troubled by wicked spirits, he requested that, "in my absence, some of the priests would go, and by their prayers remove the evil. One of them went; offered there the sacrifice of the body of Christ,^(f) praying that the mischief might cease; and, by the mercy of God, it instantly ceased." *Ibid. L. xxii. c. viii. p. 1485.* —"The Hebrews, in the victims which they offered to God, in many and various ways, as became so great a subject, prefigured the future victim, which Christ has offered. Hence Christians, by the holy oblation and participation of the body and blood of Christ,^(g) celebrate the remembrance of that sacrifice. But the Manicheans understand not what they should believe, or what observe, in this sacrifice of the Christians." *Contra Faustum, Lib. xx. c. xviii. T. vi. p. 155.*—Then, to the objection of his adversary, that the Catholics had substituted the martyrs in the place of the idols of the Gentiles, he replies: "The Christian people celebrate the memories of the martyrs with a religious solemnity, in order to excite themselves to an imitation of their constancy, to be united to their merits, and to be aided by their prayers; but to no martyr, to the God alone of martyrs,^(h) in memory of them, do we raise altars. For what prelate, assisting at the altar where the bodies of the martyrs lie, was ever heard to say: To thee Peter; to thee Paul; or to thee Cyprian, do we make

^(f) Obtulit ibi sacrificium corporis Christi.

^(g) Sacrosanctâ oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi.

^(h) At nulli martyrum, sed ipsi Deo martyrum sacrificamus.

this offering? To God alone, who crowned these martyrs, is sacrifice offered.—We frequently sacrifice to God in the churches of the martyrs, by that rite, according to which, as the scriptures of the new Testament declare, he commanded sacrifice to be offered to him. This pertains to that worship, which the Greeks call *Latria*, and which can be offered to God alone.” *Ibid.* p. 156.—“It cannot be doubted, that, by the prayers of the holy church, and by the salutary sacrifice,⁽ⁱ⁾ and by alms which are given for the repose of their souls, the dead are helped; so that God may treat them more mercifully than their sins deserved. This the whole church observes, which it received from the tradition of the fathers, to pray for those who died in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when, in their turn, they are commemorated at the sacrifice, and it is then announced, that the sacrifice is offered for them.”^(k) *De verbis Apostoli, Serm. xxxii. T. x. p. 154.*—See other passages, p. lvii, as above.

S. ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM,^(l) G. C.

“I exhort you to desist from doing these things, or not to approach the venerable altar.” *Ep. xii. L. v. p. 556.*—

⁽ⁱ⁾ *Orationibus sanctæ Ecclesiæ, et sacrificio salutare, et elemosynis.*

^(k) Hoc a patribus traditum, universa observat ecclesia, ut pro eis, qui—defuncti sunt, cum ad ipsum sacrificium commemorantur, ac pro illis quoque id offerri commemoretur.

^(l) *St. Isidore* was a priest of Pelusium, in Egypt, now known by the name of *Damietta*. He flourished from the beginning of the fifth century, till towards the year 435, or 440, and has left us a collection of more than 2000 letters, written in Greek.

“ Crimes acquire a deeper guilt from the place and time. For example, murder is always detestable ; but it is more so, when committed in a sacred place ; and still more wicked, if in the time of sacrifice.”^(m) *Ep. cccxcii. p. 705.* — “ Either cease to be guilty of such crimes, or withdraw from the sacred table, that the children of the church may safely approach to the sacred mysteries,⁽ⁿ⁾ without which they cannot be saved.” *Ep. dlxix. p. 723.*

S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, G. C.

“ We offer in the church a holy, vivifying, and unbloody sacrifice ; not believing it to be the common body and blood of man, but the real body and the real blood of the life-giving word.^(p) For common flesh cannot give life, which our Saviour himself attested, saying : *It is the spirit that quickeneth ; the flesh profiteth nothing.* (John vi. 64.)” *Declar. Anathem. xi. T. vi. p. 156.* — “ God said plainly to the Jews, that they were not pleasing to him, or rather, that he would not accept their sacrifices in shadows and figures : but foretels, that his name shall be great among all nations, and that, in every place and nation, pure and unbloody sacrifices shall be offered.”^(q) *Comm. in c. 1. Malach. T. iii. p. 830.* — *See also the letter read at Ephesus, p. lxxvi, as above.* — “ On this occasion,” &c.

(m) ἐν καιρῷ ἁγίῳ.

(n) τοῖς θεοῖς προσερχονται μυστηρίοις.

(o) καὶ ἀναιμακτον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τελευμεν θυσίαν.

(p) μαλλον ὥς ἰδίον σῶμα γεγονος, καὶ μεντοι καὶ ἅμα τὰ πάντα ζωογονῶν τὸς λογ.

(q) θύσαι καθαροὶ καὶ ἀναιμακτοί.

COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, G. C.

In this council, which was held in the year 451, the following complaint was read against Dioscorus, the bishop of Alexandria: "So great was his audacity against all—not as became a bishop, and a bishop of so great a city and of this evangelical see—as not to permit the corn to be received, which our kind emperors had granted to the churches of Lybia, on account of the sterility of the province, and because no corn is grown in it. It was granted, in the first place, that, of it the unbloody sacrifice might be offered;^(r) and then that travellers and the poor inhabitants might be aided.—From this oppressive act it has happened, that the tremendous and unbloody sacrifice has not been celebrated.^(s) *Libellus Ischyronis, &c. Conc. Gen. T. iv. p. 400.*

THEODORET, G. C.

"Melchisedec was the priest, not of the Jews, but of the Gentiles: and so Christ offered himself to God, not for the Jews only, but for all men. He opens his priesthood in the night, when *he took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave it to them, and said: Take ye, this is my body, &c.* (Matt. xxvi.) We read, that Melchisedec was a priest and a king—the figure of the true priest and king—and that he offered to God, not animals, but bread and wine. For these he presented to Abraham, whilst in spirit he contemplated in the loins of the patriarch the true image of

(r) την ἀναιμακτον θυσιαν ἐπιτελεισθαι.

(s) μητε φρικτην, και ἀναιμακτον θυσιαν ἐπιτελεισθαι.

his priesthood.—Christ is now the priest, according to the flesh born of Judah, not himself offering, but being the head of those that offer.⁽⁴⁾ For he calls the church his body, and by this church, as man, he exercises the priestly office, while, as God, he accepts the offerings that are made. For the church offers the symbols of his body and blood.^(u) *In Psal. cix. v. 4. T. 1. p. 852.*

S. LEO, L. C.

Thus writes to Dioscorus, the bishop of Alexandria: “That the discipline of our churches may in all things agree, this should be observed: That, when a more solemn feast calls the people together, and more assemble than the church can contain, the offering of the sacrifice be repeated.^(x) lest any be deprived of it; for religion and reason demand, that the sacrifice should be as often offered,^(y) as there are people to partake. Otherwise, if the custom of one mass be followed, they who cannot find place must be deprived of the sacrifice.^(z) We therefore anxiously exhort you, that you do not neglect, but join with us, as in faith so in practice, to observe a rule that by tradition is come down to us.” *Ep. xi. al. lxxxix. ad Diosc. p. 437.*

⁽⁴⁾ οὐκ αὐτος τι προσφέρειν, ἀλλὰ τῶν προσφερόντων κεφαλὴ χρηματιζών.

^(u) δέχεται τε τὰ προσφερόμενα ὡς Θεός. Προσφέρει δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία τὰ τῆς σωματικῆς ἀνθε καὶ τῆς αἱματικῆς.

^(x) Sacrificii oblatio indubitanter iteretur.

^(y) Toties sacrificium subsequens offeratur.

^(z) Si unius tantum Missæ, more servato, sacrificium offerre non possint.

S. EUCHERIUS,^(a) L. C.

“Let all unbelief be gone, since he is witness of the truth, who is the author of the gift; for the invisible priest does, by his word and secret power, change the visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood,^(b) saying thus: *Take and eat, this is my body*, &c. And therefore, as at the command of the Lord, the highest heavens, the deep waves, and the vast earth, suddenly rose out of nothing; so by the like power in the spiritual sacraments, the virtue of the word commands, and the effect obeys.^(c) Let no one doubt that these creatures, by the nod of his power, by the presence of his majesty, pass into the substance of the Lord’s body.^(d) When the creatures to be blessed by the heavenly words are placed on the altar, before they are consecrated by the invocation of

^(a) *St. Eucherius* was bishop of Lyons, and had been a monk in the convent of Lerins. Some works, very elegantly written, are ascribed to him; but I would not say that the sermon, from which I quote this passage, is from him, though I find it under his name. It is admitted, however, to be ancient; and, as it delivers explicitly the doctrine, which, in this and in the preceding centuries had been taught, its authority may fairly be added to the general mass of evidence. He probably was contemporary with Vincent of Lerins; and died about the year 454. See *Dupin* and *Cave*.

^(b) In substantia corporis et sanguinis sui, verbo suo, secretâ potestate convertit.

^(c) Verbi præcipit virtus, et rei servit effectus.

^(d) Novum et impossibile non debet videri, quod in Christi substantiam terrena et mortalia committuntur.

the Most High, the substance of bread and wine is there; but after the words of Christ, it is the body and blood of Christ.^(e) And what wonder is it, that he who could create these things by his word, should change them when created?^(f) Nay, it seems matter of less wonder, if that which is acknowledged to have been created of nothing, be now changed into better.^(g) Search what is hard for him to do, to whom it was easy to raise things visible and invisible, by the power of his will; to whom it was easy to clothe man made of the matter of clay, with the image of his own divinity," &c. *Hom. v. de Pasch. sub nomine Eusebii. Bibl. PP. T. vi. p. 636, 637.*

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

"Because under the former testament, as the apostle Paul witnesses, (Heb. vii, ix, x.) on account of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood, there was no consummation, it became necessary—God so ordaining it—that another priest according to the order of Melchisedec should arise, our Lord Jesus Christ, who might be able to consummate all that were to be sanctified, and perfect them. Wherefore, this our Lord and God, although he was about to offer himself once, on the altar of the cross, to his Father, that on it he might operate our eternal redemption; yet, because, by death, his priesthood was not to cease, he, at his last supper, the same night in which he

^(e) Post verba Christi, corpus et sanguis est Christi.

^(f) Verbo possit creata convertere.

^(g) In melius valeat commutare.

was betrayed, (1 Cor. xi.) that he might leave to his church a visible sacrifice such as the nature of man requires, by which the bloody sacrifice, once to be completed on the cross, might be represented, and its memory might continue to the end of time, and its salutary virtue be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit;—declaring himself to be the appointed priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec, he offered to his father his body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine; and, under those appearances, delivered the same to his apostles, whom at the time he appointed the priests of the New Testament. To them, and to their successors in the priesthood, he gave command to offer the same, saying, *Do this for a commemoration of me.* (Luke xxii.) So the Catholic church has always understood and taught.—This is the clean offering which the prophet Malachias foretold should be offered in every place.—This the offering which was prefigured by the various typical sacrifices of the law and of nature, comprising whatever good things they signified, consummating and perfecting all.” *Sess. xxii. c. 1. p. 189.* — “And because in this divine sacrifice which is performed in the mass, the same Christ is contained and offered in an unbloody manner, who, on the altar of the cross, offered himself in a bloody manner—the holy synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by it, to the sincerely penitent, the sins we commit, however enormous they be, are remitted. For it is one and the same victim, the same Christ now offering himself by the ministry of the priest, who offered himself on the cross; the difference being only in the manner of offering. By this offering, then, the fruits of that bloody offering are most plentifully received; so far is it from truth, that hereby the least part

is derogated from it.^(h) Wherefore, according to apostolical tradition, the mass is duly offered not only for the benefit of the living, but also for those who, though dead in Christ, are not fully cleansed from all defilement.” *Ibid. c. ii. p. 191.*

^(h) I subjoin, on this important point, the *Exposition* of our great Bossuet : “The church is so far from believing that any thing is wanting to the sacrifice of the cross, that she deems it, on the contrary, so perfectly and so fully sufficient, that whatever is afterwards added, has been instituted to celebrate its memory, and to apply its virtue. We acknowledge that all the merit of the redemption of mankind is derived from the death of the Son of God : when, therefore, in the celebration of the divine mysteries, we say : ‘We offer to thee this holy victim,’ we pretend not by this oblation to make, or to present to God, a new payment of the price of our salvation ; but to offer to him, in our behalf, the merits of Jesus Christ present, and that infinite price which he once paid for us upon the cross.”—*Exposition de la Doctrine Cathol. Sect. xiv, p. 168, Edit. Bruxelles, 1751.*

APPENDIX.

No. IV.

Extract from the DIARIO DI ROMA *of July, 1822.*

“ON the second reading of the Bill proposed in the house of Lords for the admission of Catholic Peers into Parliament, we read in the English journals, that one of the honourable members, among other reasons for his opposition, adduces the following accusation against his Holiness :—‘ that he had manifested the greatest intolerance by refusing to the burial place of the Protestants in Rome, that protection which his predecessors had granted, and that he had moreover resisted the representations of *all* the ambassadors on this subject.’

“To the above imputation we give the most unqualified contradiction, and will prove it to be perfectly false and calumnious ; indeed, we are at a loss to comprehend how it can be said ‘ that the present pope has refused to the burial place of the Protestants in Rome that protection which his predecessors had granted.’

“Preceding pontiffs merely granted permission to Protestants to be interred in the *Campo di Testaccio*. This permission has been extended to the present day, and Protestants are still buried in the same place ; nor can it be said that this place is unenclosed or unprotected, being sheltered on one side by a part of the city wall, on another by a wall which separates it from the public road, and on a third also by a wall which separates it from several

adjoining vineyards. There is likewise a guard stationed in the same field, and another in the field adjoining, for the protection of the gunpowder manufactory, and the pyramid of Caius Cestius. It is true that access to the above field is allowed to persons going to the *Monte di Testaccio*, which adjoins, as well as to those who visit the pyramid, yet it can by no means be said, that the burial ground of the Protestants is in an open, unprotected, or unguarded situation.

“Nevertheless, several Protestants, (and not all the Ambassadors. as has been falsely asserted) having expressed a desire to have a burial ground which should be entirely enclosed, or to speak more correctly, *separated* from the rest of the field, and having afterwards requested permission to encircle with a wall that portion of land destined for the said burial ground,—the pope, so far from having refused to extend, as was most falsely stated, the protection of his predecessors to the tombs of the Protestants in Rome, even exceeded their generosity, by granting to the same Protestants, permission to surround with a wall that portion of land in the same field destined for their interment. If this concession was never acted upon, the cause must be attributed to the slight alteration which the Roman government found it absolutely necessary to make respecting the situation of the former burial ground. The ground then proposed, was in the same field, and only a few paces from the former. The following will clearly explain the whole.

“In the first instance, the burial place of the Protestants was situated directly facing the pyramid of Caius Cestius, and almost immediately adjoining to it. It was no sooner reported that two walls were to be raised, one in front of the pyramid, and another on the side, to form the enclosure

for the burial place of the Protestants, than the *Accademia di San Lucca*, the *Società delle Arti*, and other establishments, as well as the commissioners entrusted with the inspection and repair of the public works of antiquity existing in Rome, immediately represented to the government in the strongest terms, that in case the said enclosures were effected, the consequence would be, that the height of the walls, and the trees which Protestants are accustomed to plant round their places of interment, would materially obstruct the view of so noble and interesting a monument as the pyramid, unique in its kind, holding so distinguished a rank among the ornaments of the capital, and claiming the attention and admiration of all connoisseurs and lovers of the Fine Arts. To these representations, made in very strong terms, were added others still stronger on the part of the public; carriages and pedestrians can at present approach the pyramid by a direct and short passage, but the new enclosure would oblige them in future to take an indirect route, at a considerable increase of distance, and much inconvenience. These certainly were arguments quite strong enough to excite in the public, just cause for remonstrance and discontent.

“After this, the government could not most assuredly consent to the formation of an enclosure in a place, where it could not be executed without sacrificing so much of the interesting view of the above remarkable monument, and without depriving the public of the convenience they now enjoy. Neither justice nor good taste could allow of such infringements. Still, in substance, his Holiness wished to comply, as far as lay in his power, with the request of the Protestants for the formation of an enclosure; and though the above reasons induced him

to refuse permission for the same in front of the pyramid, he expressed his willingness to grant a new portion of land for that purpose, situated in the same *Campo di Testaccio*, but on one side, and not in front, of the pyramid, and a few paces only from the site of the former ground. At the same time, he repeated his permission to Protestants to enclose it entirely, by surrounding it with a wall; thus fully providing for future interments, and even for the preservation, in part, of the former burial ground, a portion of which came within the precincts of the one about to be formed. The remaining part of the interred might, if it were thought proper, be transferred at any time to the new enclosure; if not, they would remain in perfect security in their present situation, which, as we have already shown, was neither unprotected nor unguarded.

“ Again, if the enclosure of the newly allotted ground was not carried into effect, the reason was, that the parents and friends of the deceased, finding themselves prevented by the urgent remonstrances made to the government from the quarters already named, from surrounding with a wall the place where the greater part of the deceased actually lay, had withdrawn their names from the subscription necessary for the completion of the second enclosure.

“ Still, this circumstance did not prevent his Holiness from carrying his own concession into effect. He gave orders to the treasury to raise at their expence, the above mentioned wall on the side towards the pyramid, so that Protestants can no longer say that their place of interment is unenclosed.

“ The foregoing is a true and simple statement of the whole transaction, for the entire correctness of which we

can fully vouch. Let the public now judge whether it can be affirmed with truth or with justice, 'that the present pope has refused to the tombs of the Protestants in Rome, that protection which his predecessors had granted.' It cannot be a matter of surprise, that, among the numerous foreigners who are received in Rome with the most courteous hospitality and marks of particular kindness, to which the generality of them are willing to testify, some should be found, who, instead of evincing the least grateful feeling for their courteous reception, take every opportunity of giving vent to their ill feeling by slander and falsehood. If to such men gratitude be too weighty a burden, we willingly free them from all obligation whatsoever; nay, if they even wish to dispense with those sentiments professed by every individual of proper education and feeling, they have our full permission so to do: but honour will ever demand that due respect be paid to truth; and whatever may be our private opinions, we should not seek to support them by recurring to the base and dishonourable arts of misrepresentation and calumny."*

Such are the merits of a case, which, as I know not that the calumny founded upon it has ever been refuted in this country, and especially in the place in which it was brought before the public,† I cannot, in justice to

* Since the above was written, the spot of ground which gave rise to this misrepresentation, has been entirely enclosed by a deep sunk fence.

† "The intolerance of the Romish church at the present day, was also displayed in the most marked manner, by the present

our cause, pass it by unnoticed. It is important on many accounts;—from the quarter from which it proceeded—from the circumstances which accompanied it—from the total absence of truth which characterized it—but above all, because it was urged as an *argument* to prove, not the intolerance of the court of Rome, but of the *Romish CHURCH*; and, consequently, as a reason why the rights of free-citizenship should be denied to an immense portion of the subjects of the King of England.

It is evident that the noble lord was unconscious of the calumny he was uttering; but its effects have, hitherto, been precisely the same as if it had been founded on the most indisputable facts, instead of resting on hearsay and misrepresentation. An unfounded accusation advanced upon slight authority, and circulated only within a narrow sphere, may, without much injury, be permitted to float its hour, and sink unheeded into the stream of oblivion. But, as the speech of a member of the British Parliament, travels not only into every village and every ale-house of the united kingdom, but to every region of the universe, and thus disseminates both the opinions and the statements which it contains, almost *ad infinitum*, and becomes either the fortunate harbinger of truth, or the evil messenger of falsehood, calumny, and injustice, to the larger portion of the civilized world; it is the duty, as well as the interest, of the parties more immediately

Pontiff refusing to grant any protection to the tombs of the Protestants who have died at Rome, although that protection had been requested by the Protestants of all countries residing at Rome, and by the ministers of Protestant sovereigns.”—Lord Colchester’s *Speech, as reported in the Courier, on the second reading of the Catholic Peers’ Bill, June 21, 1822.*

concerned, to repel the accusation by every means in their power. Coming, too, from so grave a senator, from an individual who is considered to have filled one of the most arduous and honourable stations in the kingdom, with peculiar dignity and justice—who was known to have been upon the spot to which his statement relates—to have had every facility of information—and who may be thought to have himself borne a share in the transaction:—all these circumstances combine, by giving weight to the accusation, to render it's refutation the more important. It is a grievance severely felt, and much to be lamented, that calumny of what kind soever (so prone is mankind to believe evil rather than good), is always sure to carry such a degree of conviction with it, especially among the weak and ill-disposed, as to leave the refutation, however complete, a difficult task to perform, in order to remove the stigma: it is always sure to meet the eye of many who never see it's disavowal, and the evil impression is carried with them to the grave.

The authority of the calumniator will also be weighed against the reputation of the calumniated; and it is not difficult to determine where, in the mind of prejudice, the better credit will be supposed to lie. People will feel it impossible to believe that a British senator, lately elevated by his merit to the House of Peers from the first rank in the House of Commons, and who must necessarily have to maintain a reputation for truth and justice, should so far allow himself to be misled by prejudice, as to give implicit credit to mere reports which he must have had a full opportunity of investigating, and that too for the purpose of founding upon them an ungenerous accusation against a government from which he had received the rights of hospitality in the most marked manner, and of

establishing thereon an argument against extending the benefits of the Constitution to seven millions of his fellow subjects.

This, certainly, must appear incredible to all who are unacquainted with the darkness which habitual prejudice spreads over the mind, depriving it of the will to reason, and robbing it of the faculty of judging. Such men will rather question the testimony of the accused, though supported by facts, than believe it to be true, in opposition to such an authority.

But even supposing, for a moment, the accusation to have been founded in fact, was there a shadow of justice in the inference drawn from it? Does either the Pope, or the government of Rome, constitute the Catholic Church? How absurd, then, to bring forward any act of theirs, as a proof of the intolerant spirit of the Catholic Church in general; and how much more absurd, to make the declaration with the same breath with which so intolerant a speech was delivered!

But so far from a spirit of illiberality being prevalent at Rome, it is directly the reverse. The late venerable Pontiff, Pius VII., a man revered by all, and against whom, save in this solitary instance, the breath of slander never breathed, was proverbially humane, liberal, and enlightened: and, among the many proofs that the same spirit of liberality also presides over the councils of his successor, the election of Torwalsden, as a member of all the academies in Rome, may be mentioned. Since academical honours are viewed in the same light there, as civil offices are here, this honour is a high and enviable object of distinction; and much to the credit of the capital of Catholic Christendom, which knows that merit is not the exclusive possession of any religion or of any country, both Foreigners and

Protestants are freely admitted to enjoy them. The same liberality allows the free exercise of their religion to Protestants: nay more—(unless according to the Bishop of Saint David's *Protestant's Catechism*, it be a tenet of the Established Church to revile and calumniate Catholics, which I cannot yet believe) for though some, not content with the duties of their ministry, and with worshipping God in charity and peace, so far abused their licence, as to cast aspersions and obloquy on the religion of the state that tolerated them, from which, especially under the circumstances, good sense and good feeling ought to have protected it; yet no interruption was given to the free and continued exercise of the religion, during the celebration of whose service these insults had been offered. All this was going on at the very time the noble Lord is reported to have said, that the celebration of High Mass ought no longer to be tolerated in his Majesty's dominions! Let me ask, was it charitable, was it just, was it politic, to send such statements and such opinions into every tavern and every ale-house in the kingdom, among men heated with wine and liquor; extending the guilt of the imagined crime to every Catholic in the United Empire, teaching his fellow countrymen to despise and to detest, perhaps, every tenth individual whom they met here, and nine out of ten whom they encountered on the other side of the water? It was a long series of calumnious accusations against Catholics which inflamed the public mind to that degree of insanity to which it arrived in 1780, when a mob of 50,000 Protestants put the very state into jeopardy, for the sake of demolishing what in their folly and fanaticism they believed to be, and what calumny had taught them to consider, the temples of the idolator. It was a system of calumny and misrepresentation, carried on by a succession of writers, (copying one another, and

darkened by bigotry)—the blind leading the blind—which at various periods during the three last centuries, caused torrents of innocent blood to be shed, and crimes to be perpetrated, which called to heaven for vengeance. It was the spirit evoked by this system, that, at one period, infuriated bigotry with such fiend-like emulation, that the two rival parties in the state exhausted their strength in endeavouring to affix on each other the *odium of toleration*.

APPENDIX.

No. V.

SPEECH OF MR. SHEIL,

At the Association, on moving an Address to the King, on the last Day of the Fourteen Days' Meeting.

MR. SHEIL rose and said—I gave notice that I should move that an address should be presented to the King, founded upon the letter written by the authority of his Majesty, by Lord Sidmouth, on the 23rd of September, 1821. I hold that letter in my hand. The following passage deserves to be extracted:—"I am commanded (says my Lord Sidmouth) to state, that the testimonies of dutiful and affectionate attachment which his Majesty has received from all classes and descriptions of his Irish subjects, have made the deepest impression on his mind; and that he looks forward to the period when he shall

re-visit them, with the strongest feelings of satisfaction. His Majesty trusts, that, in the mean time, not only the spirit of loyal union which now so generally exists, will remain unabated and unimpaired, but that every cause of irritation will be avoided and discountenanced, mutual forbearance and goodwill observed and encouraged, and a security be thus afforded for a continuance of that concord among themselves, which is not less essential to his Majesty's happiness, than to their own, and which it has been the chief object of his Majesty, during his residence in this country, to cherish and promote." (*Loud Cheers.*) I have read this extract from this epistolary sanative of the evils which afflict this country.—But, in reading it, I found it difficult not to pause and break into exclamation, at almost every section of this piece of amiable diplomacy—for, in reading it, the events by which this utterly abortive admonition, unsustained by any practical measure for the conciliation of Ireland, has been followed, pressed themselves upon my recollection, and I could not shut out from my memory, the scenes of ferocious discord which succeeded, almost immediately after the departure of our gracious Sovereign, and the bequest of his benevolent recommendation. Let me be allowed to revert to the passage which I have read, and put it into a free but respectful analysis. The interpreter of his Majesty's sensibilities, my Lord Sidmouth, speaks of "the affectionate attachment" of the Irish people, and "of the deepest impression" which had been made upon his Majesty's mind. Well might he speak of the "affectionate attachment" which was manifested towards our Sovereign. Do you remember, (you cannot fail to do so) the glorious spectacle which was presented upon his arrival amongst us? I do not believe that in the annals of romantic loyalty,

and in all the records of the wild chivalry of allegiance, an example could be found of more high and unanimous enthusiasm, than was displayed by the universal masses of ardent and devoted population, which hailed the entrance of King George the Fourth into this great metropolis. If most of you had not witnessed that extraordinary scene, I might attempt to describe it:—but the reality is too deeply imprinted in your recollections, to admit of any successful delineation, and you could not fail to feel that any picture, no matter how richly tinted, must be greatly below the dignity and grandeur of that important national event. I will not, therefore, attempt to paint what is inlaid in such fresh colours in the memories of every one of you. I will not tell you in what a noble triumph of peace, in what an ovation of concord, the Sovereign of the empire, of which Ireland constitutes so large a department, entered this great city. I will not recall to you the array of myriads, who were assembled to greet him, and who, with uplifted eyes and hands, and with voices, into which their hearts were thrown, sent up their invocations for his welfare:—I will not tell you how George the Fourth looked, and must have felt, upon that lofty and almost sublime occasion. If I made such an attempt, you would stop and chide me—you would say, that I fell far beneath the glory and magnificence of the scene which I should endeavour to present to you.—It is enough, therefore, that I should make a simple mention of that singular exhibition of rational enthusiasm, in order to bring it back, in all its vividness to your minds. It is stated, that the “deepest impression” was made upon his Majesty’s mind. I entertain no doubt of it. How was it possible that he should behold such demonstrations of affection and of fidelity, without a profound appreciation

of the qualities of the people from which those noble feelings derived their origin? How was it possible that he should witness what he beheld on his arrival—but above all, how could he behold what took place on his departure, without a profound and thrilling emotion? He stood upon the shore—he was surrounded by his people—he heard their prayers for his happiness offered up from hearts as honest as ever sent an orison to heaven—he saw the tears that flowed down many a manly cheek, and he beheld many a brawny arm stretched out to him in an affectionate farewell. He ascended the ship that was to waft him from the island, in which the traces of his footsteps ought to have been left in measures of benevolence behind. The winds filled the sails—the vessel went slowly and majestically through the ocean. He stood upon the deck, and thence looked back towards Ireland, and saw the hills by which she was encompassed, crowded to the tops by hundreds of thousands, who sent their benedictions along with him. Is it possible that at such a moment his heart should not have melted and dissolved within him? Did not the tears of a generous sensibility rush into his eyes, and, as the shouts of his people came from the receding shores, across the water, did he not exclaim: “I will—I will do something for Ireland.” But, I forget myself. I am hurried away by the emotions which the recollection of those striking scenes cannot fail to awaken in the bosom of every one of us. I should resume a more sober and befitting tone of sentiment—and yet, even now, I cannot avoid relapsing for a moment into the feelings which had swept me beyond the limits of temperate discussion, and exclaiming: “What, after all, has he done for Ireland?” But I return. His Majesty proceeds to say that he hopes “that every cause of irrita-

tion will be avoided and discountenanced." Alas ! what imperfect views his Majesty must have taken of the real sources of the calamities of this country ? How little he knew of the real character of the faction, which has so long trampled upon Ireland, when he conceived that his mere behest could have the effect of subduing the spirit of insolent domination, by which that ferocious confederacy, as long as they are sustained by the law, never can cease to be influenced ! What took place almost immediately after his Majesty's departure ? He left us his advice, and gave us nothing else. How did the Orangemen of Ireland fulfil it ? at their civic banquets, the watchword of ascendancy was almost instantly proclaimed. The banners of Ireland's shame were unfurled in a still more ostentatious and offensive publicity. The Sovereign himself, was insulted in the person of his representative, and Justice, when called in to avenge the affront, appeared dressed in orange ribbons. The spirit of faction got possession of the public tribunals of the country ; more vehement hatreds, and more relentless detestations ensued, than had ever before taken place, and the contending parties wanted but a pretence to rush, in a sanguinary conflict, upon each other. His Majesty hoped, indeed, " that every cause of irritation would be avoided." Did his Majesty then know so little of Ireland ?—Had he himself learned so little from his Royal observation, or had he derived so few useful instructions from his early friend and adviser, Mr. Fox, as to think it possible that as long as the exasperating disqualifications, which disgrace, and brand, and burn upon us, are permitted to continue, that the " causes of irritation " could be avoided ? His Majesty talks of " the continuance of concord." How can he imagine that concord can exist in a country where

the law itself is the hot-bed of rancour, and foment and throws up nothing but poisoned plants? Does his Majesty conceive that his mere admonition is sufficient to divest the spirit of political domination of its insolence, and to take from the consciousness of deep wrong, the indignation which, in all generous minds, it cannot fail to generate? But, it is better, at once, to speak openly and unequivocally. I will no longer pursue the spirit of this letter throughout all its phrases, or dissect its syllables. Better to give a direct and undisguised utterance to the feeling which the perusal of that letter, with the commentary which events have furnished, cannot but create.—The King came here—he was received with acclamations—he told us to live in union, concord, and peace—and he has done nothing to effectuate his benevolent wishes, and carry his own gracious injunctions into execution. What did our most gracious Sovereign mean, by directing his minister to indite such a document? I repeat the question—what did he mean? we are told “that our concord is as necessary for his happiness as for our own.” Would to Heaven, then, that he had adopted some more effectual means of promoting his own felicity. Let him look at the condition of Ireland, and pronounce how far his beneficent aspirations for our welfare have been realised. Perhaps more deadly animosities exist at this moment, than at any previous period in those annals of discord, the history of Ireland. The two great classes into which the population is divided, are marshalled in a deep and well-disciplined array against each other. A most monstrous state of things has grown up, whose features of anomaly are every day becoming more enlarged and marked. Seven millions of the people of Ireland have become so much habituated to self-government, that they

move and are regulated by exact and uniformly operating principles of universal organization. A great precedent of the power and of the union of the people has been established—on a single day, seven millions of the Irish people assembled simultaneously round the altars of their religion. Can things remain thus?—King of England, enjoiner of concord, answer the question!

I have prepared an address to his Majesty, founded upon Lord Sidmouth's letter, in which some of the topics which I have adverted to are introduced, but with that tone of respect which should mark the language of subjects towards their sovereign. Although I think that we have a good deal of reason to complain that his Majesty has not followed up his own advice by any measures for the effectuation of his purposes, yet I think that his letter furnishes indications of a disposition to do so, whenever circumstances will allow of his Royal interposition in our behalf. The conclusion of his letter is remarkable:—“His Majesty well knows the generosity and warmth of heart which distinguishes the character of his faithful people in Ireland, and he leaves them with a heart full of affection towards them, and with a confident and gratifying persuasion that this parting admonition and injunction of their Sovereign will not be given in vain.” It has been given in vain; but it depends upon his Majesty to take away from it the character of nullity and invalidity which is attached to it, and to embody his own wishes for the peace of Ireland, in an act of substantial and permanent conciliation. That he left us “with a heart full of affection,” I entertain no doubt; but it is to be desired that the cordiality of his attachment should be exemplified in some legislative exemplification of his Royal predilections in favour of Ireland. He has rightly said

that we are a generous people; let him also give us some materials for the exercise of our gratitude. He has a noble opportunity, not only of embodying his solicitude for our welfare in some practical act for the pacification of Ireland, but of commending his own name to an everlasting glory. How splendid an epitaph (for even Kings must die) he may procure for himself. He has to make his choice. What shall be written upon his sepulchre?— Shall it run thus—“Here lies the King, who was beloved by Ireland in his youth, who beguiled her in his manhood, and betrayed her in his age;” or shall it be—“Here lies the King, who by the tranquillization of Ireland, not only received for himself the attachment of seven millions of his subjects, but bound a great and powerful people in an indissoluble allegiance to the State, and while he imparted prosperity and concord to a vast portion of his dominions, gave an imperishable security to the empire, and rendered England immortal.”—Let me be permitted to pursue the train of thought into which I have fallen, and enquire what sort of monument would George the Fourth desire? What emblems does he wish upon his tomb? Shall Ireland be presented upon it, with her arms bound in fetters behind her, with shame, and sorrow, and reproach in her countenance; or shall she stand, with her manacles fallen to the earth, and with her unfettered arms uplifted in freedom to Heaven. (*Loud and continued cheers.*)

APPENDIX.

No. VI.

WORKS ON CONTROVERSY.

BOSSUET'S *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in Matters of Controversy.*

FAITH OF CATHOLICS, *confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the first five centuries.*

Protestant's Trial by the Written Word.

MILNER'S *End of Religious Controversy*—an admirable Work.

Letters to a Prebendary.

History of Winchester.

Essence of Religious Controversy. By the Rev. Dr. COOMBES.

GOTHER'S *Papist Misrepresented and Represented.*

Catholic Christian Instructed.

LINGARD'S *History of the Anglo-Saxon Church.*

Tracts.

CHRISTIANITY; *or the Evidences and Characters of the Christian Religion.* By the Right Rev. Dr. POYNTER.

Discussion Amicale.

Reply to the Most Rev. Dr. Magee. By J. K. L.

Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Faith.

Reflections on the Spirit of Controversy. By the Rev. Dr. FLETCHER.

DUKE OF BRUNSWICK'S *Fifty Reasons*; and numerous others to be had of all Catholic Booksellers.

N. B. COBBETT'S *History of the Reformation* gives a clearer insight into the principles and conduct of the Reformers in this country, than any work that has ever been published.

NOTES

NOTES ON THE CONSTITUTION

These notes are intended to be a summary of the principal provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and to be a guide to the student of the subject. They are not intended to be a complete treatise on the subject, but rather a summary of the principal provisions of the Constitution, and to be a guide to the student of the subject.

London.—Printed by
C. Richards, 100, St. Martin's Lane.

